American Planning and Civic Annual

352 A5 1947-48

Kansas City
Public Library

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

This Volume is for

REFERENCE USE ONLY

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO



From Arlington National Cemetery, the tomb of Charles Pierre L'Enfant, planner of the National Capital, looks out upon the city of his dreams.

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL

A RECORD OF RECENT CIVIC ADVANCE IN THE FIELDS OF PLANNING, PARKS, HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING THE ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON PLANNING, HELD AT NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, MAY 17, 18, 19, 1948

EDITED BY

HARLEAN JAMES

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

901 UNION TRUST BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1948

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL is sent to all paid members and subscribers of the American Planning and Civic Association and the National Conference on State Parks, who may purchase extra copies for $2 each.

The public may purchase past American Planning and Civic Annuals and the current Annual for $3 each.

A complete set of the American Planning and Civic Annuals (13 vols. 1935–48), may be purchased for $20.

Copyright 1948
By American Planning and Civic Association

Mount Pleasant Press
J. HORACE MCFARLAND CO.
Harrisburg, Pa.

Reference
352
A5
1947-48

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION ix

THE NATION

NATIONAL PARKS

Planning for National Parks and Parkways *Newton B. Drury* 1
Preserving Our Public Possessions . . . *Struthers Burt* 9

WANTED: A NATIONAL LAND POLICY

Saving the Nation's Soil *Paul Bestor* 11
Making the Most of the Nation's Waters *Kenneth A. Reid* 14
Without Conservation We Perish . . *Bernard De Voto* 25
Discussion *Henry James* 27

IN THE STATES

STATE PLANNING

Land Planning in New Jersey . . *Russell Van N. Black* 29
State Constitutional Provisions for Planning *Spencer Miller, Jr.* 34
Seashore Planning *J. Spencer Smith* 38
Discussion, Leader: *H. Kenyon Francis* Reporter: *Ronald Scott* 41
Round Table on Service of State Planning Boards to Local Planning Reporter: *F. A. Batstone* 43

STATE PARKS

The Nature of State Parks and Parkways . *Laurie D. Cox* 50
State Parks and Related Recreation Areas 58

COUNTY AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING

The Metropolitan Region at the Crossroads *Paul Windels* 61
The South Points the Way *Thomas H. Reed* 67
Metropolitan Planning in Saint Louis *Harland Bartholomew* 78
Area Planning—A Summary *Alexander Elder* 88
County Parks and Parkways *Gilmore D. Clarke* 91

Mem's.
1285966
DEC 2 7 1948

PAGE

URBAN PLANNING

Urban Transportation

Metropolitan Transportation Planning . *Austin J. Tobin* 96
Highway Planning in Metropolitan Areas . *C. M. Noble* 104
Planning for Urban Transit *E. D. Merrill* 113
Relieving Traffic Congestion *Robert A. Mitchell* 117
Discussion Reporter: *Henry Cohen* 121
Round Table on Urban Redevelopment Reporter: *David M. Walker* 122
Round Table on Zoning . . Reporter: *A. H. C. Shaw* 125

The Newark Plan

Introduction *Vincent J. Murphy* 128
The Central Planning Board . . . *Peter A. Cavicchia* 131
The Master Plan of Newark, New Jersey *Harry W. Alexander* 132
Discussion Leader *J. Anton Hagios* 144
General Discussion Reporter: *Robert F. Foeller* 150

PLANNING EDUCATION

Citizens' Part in Planning

A Mayor's Planning Committee . . *J. Mitchell Garrison* 153
A Brief History of City Planning in St. Louis, and its Success as Related to Citizen Understanding and Support *J. A. McClain, Jr.* 155
A Permanent Citizens Council on Planning *Granville W. Moore* 160
Eternal Citizen Vigilance Is the Price of Planning . . . *Clifford Randall* presented by *Maynard Meyer* 165
Newark Citizens Study the Plan . . . *John R. Burnett* 170
Round Table on Citizens Organizations for Community Planning Reporters: *Park H. Martin* and *Edward D. Connor* 173
Round Table on Planning Education for Citizens . . . Reporter: *George J. Albrecht* 176

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

PAST PRESIDENTS

J. Horace McFarland — Frederic A. Delano — Horace M. Albright

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chairman of the Board . Horace M. Albright, New York, N. Y.
President U. S. Grant, 3rd, Washington, D. C.
First Vice-President . . Earle S. Draper, Washington, D. C.
Second Vice-President . Tom Wallace, Louisville, Ky.
Third Vice-President . . Harland Bartholomew, St. Louis, Mo.
Treasurer C. F. Jacobsen, Washington, D. C.
Executive Secretary . . Harlean James, Washington, D. C.
Counsel Flavel Shurtleff, Marshfield Hills, Mass.
Editor-Librarian . . . Mrs. Dora A. Padgett, Washington, D. C.

Harold S. Buttenheim, New York, N. Y.
Paul Carrington, Dallas, Tex.
Henry P. Chandler, Washington, D. C.
Gilmore D. Clarke, Ithaca, N. Y.
E. J. Condon, Chicago, Ill.
Philip H. Elwood, Ames, Iowa
John M. Gries, Conover, Ohio
Byron Harvey, Jr., Chicago, Ill.
Elisabeth M. Herlihy, Boston, Mass.
B. H. Kizer, Spokane, Wash.
Frank M. Lindsay, Decatur, Ill.
J. C. Nichols, Kansas City, Mo.
Harold S. Osborne, New York, N. Y.
Clifford A. Randall, Milwaukee, Wis.
Owen J. Roberts, Chester Springs, Pa.
C. Melvin Sharpe, Washington, D. C.
L. Deming Tilton, San Francisco, Calif.
Samuel P. Wetherill, Philadelphia, Pa.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mrs. Henry A. Barker, Providence, R. I.
Edward M. Bassett, New York, N. Y.
Mrs. Edward W. Biddle, Ardmore, Pa.
Struthers Burt, Southern Pines, N. C.
Victor M. Cutter, Boston, Mass.
Jay N. Darling, Des Moines, Iowa
Miss H. Marie Dermitt, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Francis P. Farquhar, San Francisco, Calif.
J. P. Fishburn, Roanoke, Va.
A. P. Giannini, San Francisco, Calif.
Edwin C. Graham, Washington, D. C.
Chauncey J. Hamlin, Buffalo, N. Y.
James M. Langley, Concord, N. H.
Charles F. Lewis, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Thomas H. MacDonald, Washington, D. C.
Henry T. McIntosh, Albany, Ga.
Mrs. Junius S. Morgan, Princeton, N. J.
Crispin Oglebay, Gates Mills, Ohio
Frederick Law Olmsted, Brookline, Mass.
Lawson Purdy, New York, N. Y.
Almon E. Roth, San Francisco, Calif.
J. Woodall Rodgers, Dallas, Texas
William H. Schuchardt, Beverly Hills, Calif.
A. D. Taylor, Cleveland, Ohio
Mrs. A. L. Thurman, Washington, Conn.
M. L. Wilson, Washington, D. C.
Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Philadelphia, Pa.
Baldwin M. Woods, Berkeley, Calif.

HEADQUARTERS

901 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chairman of the Board — Tom Wallace, Kentucky
President James F. Evans, New York
First Vice-President Thomas W. Morse, North Carolina
Second Vice-President Frank D. Quinn, Texas
Treasurer C. F. Jacobsen, Washington, D. C.
Executive Secretary Harlean James, Washington, D. C.

Frederick J. Adams, Nebraska
Horace M. Albright, New York
Mrs. Edmund B. Ball, Indiana
Howard B. Bloomer, Michigan
Paul V. Brown, Indiana
Laurie D. Cox, New Hampshire
Charles A. DeTurk, Michigan
V. W. Flickinger, Iowa
Mrs. Henry Frankel, Iowa
C. L. Harrington, Wisconsin
William M. Hay, Tennessee
W. Ed Jameson, Missouri
Robert Kingery, Illinois
Joseph R. Knowland, California
Harold W. Lathrop, Colorado
Herbert Maier, California
Harry T. Martin, Washington
Charles G. Sauers, Illinois
Lewis G. Scoggin, Florida
Russell B. Tobey, New Hampshire
Harold S. Wagner, Ohio
Conrad L. Wirth, Washington, D. C.

Headquarters
901 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.

The two organizations join in the publication of

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL
and the
QUARTERLY, PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT

The purpose of the American Planning and Civic Association is the education of the American people to an understanding and appreciation of: local, state, regional and national planning for the best use of urban and rural land, and of water and of other natural resources; the safeguarding and planned use of local and national parks; the conservation of natural scenery; the advancement of higher ideals of life and civic beauty in America; the improvement of living conditions and the fostering of wider educational facilities in schools and colleges along these lines.

The purpose of the National Conference on State Parks is to inform the public through a central clearing house of information, publications, conferences, courses of training in schools and colleges, and by other educational means, of the value of state parks, historic sites, forests and preserves, suitable for recreation, study of natural history and science, preservation of wild life and conservation of natural scenery, by the development within the States of well-balanced state park systems; to the end that every citizen of the United States shall have easy access to state recreation areas and appreciate their value as a recognized form of land use.

INTRODUCTION

THE Proceedings of the Citizens Conference on Planning presented in this ANNUAL are much more than expressions of opinion on the part of the speakers. The subjects chosen represent vital parts of the year-round educational program conducted by the American Planning and Civic Association.

The American Planning and Civic Association was a pioneer in the field of conservation of natural resources. It led the educational campaign which resulted in the establishment of the National Park Service in 1917. It is appropriate, therefore, that the ANNUAL this year should open with Director Drury's account of contemporary problems and Struthers Burt's defense of Jackson Hole National Monument, for the Civic Association has been consistently committed to the building of an adequate National Park System composed of qualified units and defended against all commercial encroachments. Tom Wallace, who presided at the session on Preserving our Public Possessions, has an enviable record as a defender of natural resources from exploitation.

The section on Our Public Land and Water Resources, presented by Paul Bestor, President of Friends of the Land; Kenneth A. Reid, Executive Director of the Izaak Walton League, and Bernard DeVoto, Author and Editor of the *Easy Chair* in Harper's Magazine, contains convincing evidence that the program which the American Planning and Civic Association has long advocated in the conservation of our natural resources is now desperately needed if our civilization is to survive. From the time when Theodore Roosevelt called that first Governors Conference on Conservation in 1908, and Dr. J. Horace McFarland contributed his declaration of principles, the Civic Association has been involved in a succession of current issues. This year Fairfield Osborn's book on *Our Plundered Planet* and William Vogt's book on *The Road to Survival*, have pointed out to the American people the tragic situation in which our criminally wasteful past has placed us. We thus have new ammunition against the many pending proposals to release our public lands and relax our public land and water policies for immediate and unjustified exploitation.

For more than a quarter of a century the Association has advocated state planning. The section on this important phase of planning is presented by Russell Van Nest Black, Spencer Miller, Jr. and J. Spencer Smith, all covering important accomplishments. There was also an interesting Round Table on the Service of State Planning Boards to Local Planning, under the Chairmanship of Elisabeth Herlihy.

On State Parks, Dr. Laurie D. Cox stressed the functional aspects of national, state, regional and local parks, and Franklin Conklin, Jr., President of the famous Essex County Park Commission, outlined accomplishments in that area. See also State Park Acreages.

With the growth of cities, problems of metropolitan planning and administration have developed. Paul Windels, President of the Regional Plan Association of New York, reported progress of planning and population adjustment in our largest metropolis. Dr. Thomas H. Reed told of the latest promising consolidation of Baton Rouge and the parish, under which a certain autonomy of each is preserved. Harland Bartholomew outlined the proposed inter-state plan for the metropolitan district of St. Louis and Alexander Elder explained the workings of the Essex County Joint Planning Boards. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, recalled the early history of the Westchester County parkways.

The Civic Association was organized about the time modern planning came into common practice. During the years the subject has developed, become more thorough, related itself to existing social and economic conditions, and, through precedents in pioneer communities, become involved in bolder recommendations than could have been countenanced when the benefits of sound planning were less recognized.

Urban Transportation continues to be one of the vital elements in metropolitan planning. Austin J. Tobin, Executive Director of the Port of New York Authority; C. M. Noble, Engineer, New Jersey State Highway Commission; E. D. Merrill, President of the Capital Transit Company of Washington; and Robert A. Mitchell, Chief of the Bureau of Traffic Engineering of Philadelphia, discuss current problems in the light of their experience. An introduction was provided by Col. A. B. Barber, Manager of the Transportation and Communication Department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The Round Table on Urban Redevelopment, under the chairmanship of Paul Oppermann, indicated progress in plans for specific Redevelopment Areas, but brought out the frustration caused by the inability to find suitable, or indeed any, housing into which to move the families now living in these areas chosen for redevelopment. Until the supply of lower cost housing has in some measure caught up with the demand and prices have leveled off, at least in proportion to other costs, there seems to be little hope that many families living in slums may be moved from their present abodes.

The Round Table on Zoning is of perennial interest. Ever since the first tentative zoning laws about the time of World War I, zoning has made progress. There are some who are discouraged; but when one considers that the very principle of establishing public control of private property under the Constitution, without compensation, was in doubt in the early twenties, one can hardly fail to recognize the change of sentiment and the solid backlog of court decisions under which zoning is now a recognized form of community control. Flavel Shurtleff, Chairman of the Round Table, as always, conducted a lively session, reported by A. H. C. Shaw of Cleveland.

The reason for meeting in Newark was that a comprehensive plan has just been completed by Harland Bartholomew and Associates. Mayor Vincent J. Murphy, who has attended recent National Citizens Conferences on Planning, was host and presented an introduction to the section on The Newark Plan. Hon. Peter A. Cavicchia, Commissioner of the City of Newark, outlined the responsibilities of the Central Planning Board, and Harry W. Alexander, of the staff of Harland Bartholomew & Associates, presented the principal features of the Comprehensive Plan. J. Anton Hagios, Manager of the Broad Street and Merchants Association, told of the solid citizen backing behind the plan.

As is appropriate at these citizens planning conferences and throughout the year, emphasis is placed on the citizens' part in planning. At a session presided over by Earle S. Draper, Vice-President of the Association, reports were heard from the four cities in which the conference has been held in recent years—J. Mitchell Garrison of Omaha, Joseph A. McClain, Jr. from St. Louis, Granville W. Moore from Dallas and Clifford Randall, represented by Maynard W. Meyer, from Milwaukee. All testified that the Conference had exercised a definitely beneficial influence on the community. John R. Burnett told of the efforts of the Central Planning Board of Newark to inform the citizens of the plans.

The Round Table on Citizens Organizations for Community Planning which held two sessions was an evidence in itself of the deep interest in the subject. The program was developed by Chairman Kenneth P. Vinsel of Louisville and reported by Park H. Martin of Pittsburgh. The recommendations to the Association have been taken under serious advisement. The Round Table on Planning Education for Citizens brought in recommendations for extending courses and preparation of teaching material. Philip H. Elwood of Iowa State College has conducted this Round Table for two years, assisted by a working committee.

Because of the limitation of time, several subjects in which the Association is active were not included at the Newark Conference, and because of the high cost of printing, additional articles on these subjects have not been included in this ANNUAL. Some of these subjects will be included in *Planning and Civic Comment* as they become live issues.

Public spirited citizens, awake to the jeopardy in which the remnant of our national resources stand at the present day will be alert to prevent proposed exploitations all along the line.

Following the Planning Conference, the American Planning and Civic Association joined with the National Council on Roadside Improvement, the American Nature Association, The Garden Club of America and the National Council of State Garden Clubs in a Joint Conference on Roadside Improvement. Some progress was noted, particularly where parkways, with sufficiently wide rights-of-way—national, state and county—have been built on which no intrusions have been permitted. But a danger signal was sounded by those who realize that

the accumulated funds of the Federal and state gasoline taxes will stimulate an enormous building and rebuilding program of highways which, in many instances, are not legally protected from inappropriate intrusions. Where county zoning is adequate, commercial areas are restricted, and roadsides are protected from indiscriminate development. It was generally agreed that freeways which definitely have no right of access from abutting property should be protected from any sort of structures which divert the drivers' attention. The Pennsylvania Turnpike, with its high rates of speed, and its freedom from billboards, actually proved a safer road to travel than other highways, with lower rates of speed and constant demands on the drivers' attention through large and gaudy billboards.

One of the most important activities in which the Association has been engaged is related to the planning and development of the Federal City. A committee was set up in 1922–23 under the chairmanship of Hon. Frederic A. Delano, who was succeeded by Hon. Owen J. Roberts and later by C. Melvin Sharpe. It was due to the work of this committee that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission was created in 1926. The Committee has promoted comprehensive and consistent planning for the Nation's Capital for more than a quarter of a century. The Committee has recognized the evil of the failure to enfranchise the residents of Washington who have no voting privileges elsewhere. But the Committee has opposed home-rule for the Federal City which belongs to all of the citizens of the United States. Perhaps, during the 81st Congress an amendment to the Constitution will be adopted which will permit residents of Washington who do not vote elsewhere to vote for representation in Congress and for the President of the United States. It is believed that such an amendment would be promptly ratified by the requisite number of States. In the meantime Federal control over the Federal City, in which the Federal Government owns some 40 percent of the area and in which it will own more as the country grows and Federal Buildings increase, conforms to a basic principle of adapting authority to responsibility. And justice to the unenfranchised residents of the District can be secured by the Constitutional amendment.

Again we would call the attention of our readers to the fact that this American Planning and Civic Annual is issued in conjunction with the quarterly—*Planning and Civic Comment*, which supplements the information presented in the Annual with current news. Taken together, they cover Association activities.

Horace M. Albright, *Chairman of the Board*
U. S. Grant, 3rd, *President*
Harlean James, *Executive Secretary*

THE NATION

NATIONAL PARKS

Planning for National Parks and Parkways

NEWTON B. DRURY, Director, National Park Service, Washington, D. C.

THE American Civic Association, now the American Planning and Civic Association, was in large measure responsible for the creation of the National Park Service, as authorized by Congress in 1916. During the years since, this Association has been one of the staunchest supporters and defenders of the National Park System, and the concept of conservation that it represents. It is a pleasure to acknowledge this record.

J. Horace McFarland, for many years President of the American Civic Association, and a member of the Board of Directors of the American Planning and Civic Association, when he was working to establish the National Park Service said:

"It is very fortunate for the land that . . . there have been set aside from the national domain certain special places covered under the general name of national parks. These are the high-schools of patriotism; these are the spots in which the casual citizen is likely to become a real citizen, willing to work or fight for the United States. . . ."

I believe that is as true today as it was in 1916 when Dr. McFarland first stated it.

Another member of this Association, Frederick Law Olmsted, great contemporary American landscape architect and planner, crystallized the National Park Idea by framing the park formula in the Act passed by Congress establishing the National Park Service:

". . . to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

This, the core of the National Park Idea—conserving areas, whole, for public enjoyment—has been universally accepted as sound public land policy, yet it has been a storm center ever since its origin and probably always will be, for as long as parks contain public resources which someone conceivably could exploit for personal advantage, raids will be staged to try to get those resources out of the parks. At all such times the American Planning and Civic Association has been, and continues to be, a bulwark for the National Park System.

In controversies centering around the conservation of a great natural area for public enjoyment, there is one recurring, fundamental issue. It may be presented in many different ways and at times hardly be

recognizable as such, but it is always the same, the real question at issue, and sooner or later must be answered in categorical terms. That question is, "why should the area be held inviolate?" as prescribed in the National Park Organic Act.

It will be stated, for instance, that the trees are mature and that to let them fall down and decay would be wasteful. It will be stated that not only is it thriftier management to harvest the mature trees but that selective logging will leave a healthier forest which will be "just as good" for park purposes. It will be stated that grazing by livestock will reduce the fire hazard and that mountain meadows that are not being grazed are being withheld from production of food. It will be argued that the damming of streams and lakes for irrigation and power will make them more useful for recreation, will do little real harm, and will bring great economic benefits.

The question, *why*, propounded in these various ways, must be met. It is not enough to quote the basic act of 1916. It is not enough to say that the natural forest is more satisfying, more inspiring, than the cut-over forest; the virgin mountain meadow with its clean streams, wild flowers and native wildlife more pleasing and interesting than the grazed meadow, the cow pasture; the natural streams and lakes with their normal seasonal variations more satisfying to people for recreation than the fluctuating reservoir with its unsightly shoreline of dead vegetation or the stream that has for all practical purposes been dried up by diversion structures. In fact, no plan of land management has yet been devised that will permit us to chop down the tree and still leave it standing to look at. We cannot eat our cake and have it too, which is a fact that park planners must never forget.

These replies we make whenever the issue is raised, but we have to go deeper if we are to find the compelling reason. The real reason for holding these areas inviolate is *their greatness*. Almost too late we have recognized in them a fast-dwindling heritage of beauty and wonder that it is the concern of all Americans to preserve.

If we are going to whittle away at great natural or historic areas, we should recognize at the very beginning that all such whittlings are cumulative and that the end product will be mediocrity. Greatness will be gone.

This is reason enough for holding the national parks inviolate and it is reason enough for placing some of the finest remnants of our once great forest cover and other areas of great scenic, scientific and historic value in the park status of national parks.

The American Planning and Civic Association has been not only an effective defender of the National Park System but has played an important part, also, in the shaping, or planning, of the system. The published literature of the association constitutes a fertile source of park planning facts and ideas. Concerning the general scope of the National

Park System, I recall such pronouncements from the association as this, enumerating the kinds of areas that the System should include:

> Areas that are nationally of more value for recreation than for any other use: great scenic areas; outstanding stretches of the ocean beaches; nationally important prehistoric and historic sites, objects, and buildings; the finest representative examples of native plant and animal life in their natural habitat; the most instructive geological exhibits—such as the Grand Canyon; and a system of nationally important scenic and historic parkways.

In this Country, public parks and parkways are, first of all, democratic achievements, products of group action, and they must at all times have public support if they are to survive. Perhaps this very essential, at times appearing to be a necessary evil, is their greatest source of strength. For what the public knows about and approves, it supports and defends. What it does not know about can easily be lost before effective support can be raised. To illustrate, it is hardly conceivable that anyone would be so rash as to propose damming or logging a well-known beauty-spot such as Yosemite Valley. But such proposals are frequently made for the less visited corners of the parks, the places which may some day be just as important to the public for recreation as the better known places are today but which are at present, for one reason or another, being held in reserve. The story of Hetch Hetchy valley is too long and complicated to be told here, but those familiar with it know what a loss to the Nation was involved in the building of the dam that wiped out this lovely valley.

So much for the reasons why national parks should be held inviolate and the question as to what kinds of areas are worthy of national park status. It seems logical next to ask, how much of any worthy area should be included in a park? This is indeed a problem in basic planning.

"How much is enough?" In attempting to answer this question it must be admitted, I believe, that as with other national park standards, we are not dealing in hard and fast rules. Rarely is it possible to say that a park boundary, for instance, must be placed at such and such a location and nowhere else. If park matters were that exact, the problems would be easy. The question of "how much is enough?" depends upon the character of the area to be preserved and upon the type of human use contemplated. Reasonable recommendations must be based upon careful study of the essential facts by qualified people, whose judgments, in turn, must also recognize the practical limits within which the project is feasible. Often it is necessary to be satisfied with half a loaf. This, however, is not to say that it all adds up to a matter of opinion and expediency; objectives and facts and sound judgment are still controlling. The question really gets down to this: the purpose being to maintain the integrity of a great natural spectacle, how much land must be held inviolate to accomplish this?

If a scenic or forested area is to be conserved in its natural condition we have learned that such an area must be extensive. A reservation

which is to include the natural habitat of large game animals, such, for instance, as elk with their migratory habits, must comprise a fairly spacious area.

If a natural area is to be used without impairment by large numbers of people—and the parks are set apart to be enjoyed—it must be spacious and varied enough that people can be dispersed to many points within it and not be subjected to crowding. There should be ample space for facilities and accommodations of varying types—roads, trails, hotels, lodges, camps, utilities, winter-use areas, museums, outdoor amphitheaters, etc.—without impinging upon or impairing outstanding objectives within the area or without destroying its natural or wilderness quality.

Whether the area to be preserved is a small historic site or a large natural area, we try to arrive at boundaries for a reservation that will include the kinds of things which it is desired to preserve and that will be susceptible of conservation and development for public use without impairment.

At Olympic National Park, for instance, there are big game animals including elk and cougar and an extraordinary combination of glacier-clad mountains, alpine meadows and luxuriant forests such as are preserved nowhere else in our Country. A spacious area is indicated. At the Statue of Liberty, on the other hand, all that is needed is the relatively small island upon which this world-famous symbol is situated, to provide a proper setting for the statue and space for the facilities required by the visitors. So far, as you all know, even though the area is only 10.38 acres, we have not had sufficient funds to develop that island, or provide the facilities that will be in keeping with its place in the Nation's history. We hope that public awareness will bring about the necessary corrective action.

Turning, now, to some of the practical phases of national park and parkway establishment, we come to grips with more tangible problems. Obstacles which must be overcome in national park and parkway land acquisition are so unusual as to be virtually unique in public land conservation. The National Park Service is not looking for new fields to conquer. Our load is far more than we are staffed or financed to handle creditably now. Nevertheless, park land acquisition ought to be on a more systematic, orderly basis than is possible under present circumstances, but no such program has yet been authorized. Except in rare and unusual cases, the lands in the National Park System, unless reserved from the public domain, have come into public ownership principally through donation or by purchase with donated funds. This is, to say the least, a most unusual procedure for the Government of a Nation of 140,000,000 people to follow in the conduct of one of its regularly established functions.

A national park or monument may be established with certain pri-

vate inholdings so situated that their existence not only prevents the proper protection, development and use of the parks, but upon which unsightly and undesirable private developments may flourish. Year after year the situation becomes worse and the private inholdings become harder to acquire because of increasing value. In fact there are some 600,000 acres of private and other non-federal lands in the National Park System today valued at over $20,000,000, and still no systematic program of dealing with them has yet been authorized. Such a program is one of our most crying needs.

On a par with this land acquisition anomaly is that of payments to the States and counties in lieu of taxes. While there may be legitimate question as to whether such payments should be made at all, the fact remains that they *are* made, and in very substantial sums, by nearly every Federal Agency administering conservation lands, excepting the National Park Service. This, quite frankly, amounts to serious and detrimental discrimination against the national parks. The Jackson Hole issue, to cite a case in point, could have been solved satisfactorily many years ago if payments to the county in lieu of taxes had been authorized. Other national park projects have been defeated and lost because of this disparity between the National Park Service and other Federal land-managing agencies.

These two highly important park problems—the need for a systematic national-park, land-purchase procedure and the placing of parks on a parity of other types of Federal reservations in respect to payments in lieu of taxes—are embodied in the Butler Bill in the Senate and in the LeFevre Bill in the House. While it would be improper for me to attempt to influence the deliberations of the Congress on these bills, there surely can be no impropriety in expressing a fervent hope that some relief in these matters will be forthcoming soon. It is hard to plan without it.

Up to this point we have been considering some of the problems of park land planning, beginning with the core of the national park idea—that is, the compelling reason why parks should be held inviolate—after which we touched briefly on the kinds of areas that are generally considered worthy of national park status; on how much of any worthy area is enough and, lastly, on some of the problems of national park and parkway establishment. When these considerations have been dealt with, there comes the specific question as to how to plan for development.

Here, again, park planners, as a rule, turn to a rather simple but fundamental guiding principle, namely, that the developments for each area shall be those which will help people to enjoy the objects or qualities for which that area is established, without its impairment. And when we speak of *impairment* we have in mind not only physical damage, but also damage to the tone, the character, the *atmosphere*, if you will, of the parks. This immediately eliminates a large number of so-called *improve-*

ments which, in effect, would amount to mere gilding of the lily. I refer to such proposals as have been made to us in all seriousness:

1. Floodlighting the massive trunk of the General Sherman tree in Sequoia National Park.
2. Installing a phonograph and loud speaker in Grand Canyon to be played at sunset.
3. Damming the creeks above the falls at Yosemite, so that the impounded water can be released at the time of greatest visitation—much like the old-time fountain that played only when the train came into the station.

The list, unfortunately, might be multiplied.

In all such matters, our motto is *Restraint*

Asking ourselves in each case, "what will best reveal the area or object to be exhibited?" and "what is in keeping with the area's greatness?" there is better chance that we will succeed in creating and maintaining variety without descending to nondescript mediocrity. Nothing, it is true, could be more deadly than a stereotyped plan of development for all areas. The plan of development for Grand Canyon, for instance, will of necessity be quite different from the plan of development for the Everglades. Conditions in these two instances are so different—topography, means of access, types of visitors, perishability of the primary exhibits, and many other things. But this is also true of almost all of the 178 units in the National Park System. The problems are so different, and indeed so subject to variation of opinion as to leave us with a strong sense of humility in attempting to cope with them.

We try to find a norm, based on imagination tempered by common sense. Most of our visitors seem to feel that we have had some success.

We cannot, however, report a record of 100 percent satisfied customers. There is the story of one visitor from the city to one of the most beautiful of the parks, who, when on arrival he learned that there was no motion picture theater, no bowling alley, no dance that night, exclaimed: "Gee whiz!" What do they expect us to do here—look at the scenery?"

To forestall hasty and ill-advised developments, as well as to arrive at the best possible plan in the National Park Service we have what we call a Master Plan for each area. I shall not go into details about this master-plan procedure for it is well understood by this group, but it is well to re-emphasize that the master plan for each area embodies the best thinking and advice of the administrators and the technical divisions of the Service—often with the added benefit of study and advice from recognized authorities outside the Service—and that to keep each plan current it is subject to annual review and such revisions as seem desirable. For these master plans cannot remain static. They evolve in the light of accumulating, and sometimes very sad, experience.

Related to the master plan is a schedule of construction and physical improvement projects, grouped according to the priority of their urgency, which schedule we call the Project Construction Program. Projects on

this schedule must have first been approved and included in the master plan. The Project Construction Program originates, as it should, with the individual park areas and is carefully reviewed and sifted at each administrative and technical level of the Service.

As an aftermath of the war, the whole physical plant of park structures and facilities is now in deteriorated condition. Millions of visitors beyond the planned capacities of those facilities are now coming to the parks and further accentuating the strain upon these overtaxed structures. There were 25,250,000 visitors last year, and at the present rate of increase we may have close to 30,000,000 this year. As a result of these pyramiding needs the Project Construction Program for the National Park System, covering all necessary replacements and new structures, now totals $395,000,000. In other words, we are almost $400,000,000 behind. Others are probably in the same boat. It is probable that the state, county, metropolitan and city park systems are in comparable condition. This is unquestionably one of the most pressing problems today faced by park authorities and, thus far, adequate relief measures are not in sight. This is presented, not in complaint, but simply to record the realization that our long-range planning forces upon us.

Then there is another perplexing aspect of our planning. In the very process of making natural wonders and historic and prehistoric sites available to the people who own them, there is an element of *human erosion* that must be controlled if we are to be true to the purpose of the parks. At Mesa Verde, for instance, we find it impossible to permit visitors through Cliff Palace, in the free manner of a few years ago, for this was causing serious damage to an irreplaceable prehistoric structure. It will have to be viewed from near-by.

Crowded campgrounds, too closely grouped accommodations—the urban-type of traffic, menaces to public health and safety—all the problems of a municipality are present at Yellowstone, Yosemite and other large and popular national parks. We cannot be blind to these problems and we are not stinting our efforts to solve them. We hope gradually to do it in a manner that will not unreasonably curtail the freedom of the public to enjoy these extraordinary possessions of all of us.

Keeping in mind that our first responsibility is to protect the parks, we must also realize that protection, alone, is negative and is not enough. On the positive side, our job is to try to develop and administer the parks in such ways that people who come to visit them will get the greatest possible benefit and satisfaction out of their visit. If we fail in that, we fail dismally.

National parkways, to which most of what has been said thus far applies, involve an interesting application of the park idea. Parkways may be said to be elongated parks with a road or trail through them. They are free from commercial traffic, the cluttered unsightliness of

the typical roadside, the interruptions of uncontrolled access and, in general, from grade crossings.

A city may establish a parkway as an approach to an important attraction of its environs. A State may use it to provide access and to connect its state parks, as does the Southern State Parkway on Long Island. The Redwood Highway in California, revealing the principal attractions of the Redwood Region, is not a state parkway, but partakes largely of the character of one since where the Redwood forests are finest it passes through so many state parks. The parkway principle, unfortunately, has not always been applied to the beautiful landscapes lying on the route between the state-owned Redwood Groves.

National parkways link places of outstanding historic or scenic significance and unfold to the traveler otherwise inaccessible aspects of the charm and beauty and history of the intervening countryside. While fundamental national park policies apply with respect to the treatment of major features, along a parkway, standards of development and means of access differ from those which guide the development of other areas of the National Park System.

The parkway has come to find its place in two categories: one as a supplement to the highway system, including those which provide an alternate route for passenger cars to relieve an overcrowded highway; the other as a supplement to the park system. Proposals for a Mississippi River Parkway, the extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway into New England and others of similar character indicate the probability, or at least considerable public desire, that the planning and construction of national parkways will be greatly extended.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the American Planning and Civic Association performs a public service of inestimable value in holding these Annual National Conferences on Planning. As a result of the exchange of ideas here, of the stimulus and inspiration of meeting with others who are engaged in related work, there is brought about a refinement and growth of planning thought and theory. Perhaps there is one goal which more than any other, unites all planners: that our planning shall be such as to insure and enhance the greatness of America.

Preserving Our Public Possessions

STRUTHERS BURT, Author, Jackson, Wyoming

AS PERHAPS many of you know, I am, myself a stockman. I have lived for many years on my Wyoming ranch, in the Jackson Hole country. I know Jackson Hole and I know the people living on the ranches and in the towns of this spectacularly beautiful region. We live in the shadow of the magnificent Tetons, now, happily, preserved in a National Park. But, unhappily, the boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park barely take in the string of crystal clear glacial lakes which hug the mountains like a diamond necklace. In the park there is no part of Jackson Hole. Nothing of the flanking valley is included. We saw the sorry type of development which began to grow along the county road—the only means of access to the park, since the enabling act prohibits road exploitation.

It was this uncontrolled honky-tonk development that induced John D. Rockefeller, Jr. to purchase the private lands which have proved so troublesome to the administrators of national parks and national forests. One would think that a public-spirited citizen who was generous enough to spend a million and a half dollars in order to eliminate private lands scattered over public possessions, would have no trouble in persuading the Federal Government to accept a valuable gift. But, since Mr. Rockefeller bought the lands in order to see them protected as a worthy part of a national park or monument, he has been unwilling to turn over the title until he is assured that these lands will be administered in the public good.

He realized only too clearly that the Grand Teton National Park is incomplete when from all the many peaks and high lookouts visitors must see untoward developments in the abutting valley. He thought that there should be opportunity for visitors to traverse the valley and look upon the magnificent mountains without inappropriate intrusions.

The Secretary of the Interior, under the Act of Congress of 1906, created the Jackson Hole National Monument, not only to protect the Grand Teton National Park, but to protect for all time, this important historic area which played such an important part in the early explorations of the Northwest. Immediately, a great clamor arose which almost persuaded the people of this country, including some eminent editors, that the sentiment in the Jackson Hole country, was against the monument. It was claimed that valuable grazing lands were removed from use, that the Secretary had acted arbitrarily, that no national monument should be created by executive order of the President, without specific Act of Congress (though the Act of 1906 authorized precisely this procedure). A prominent actor, who occupied a summer cottage in the national forest, and owned one cow, was pictured as an indignant and protesting stockman claiming that his range was threatened.

What are the facts? In the first place, that part of Jackson Hole, lying between the Tetons and the Snake River, contains very little valuable grazing land. Those stockmen who had rights in the region, principally as a passage from summer to winter grazing lands, were assured by the Secretary that their rights would not be abridged.

In the second place there are in the town of Jackson and in the surrounding country many local citizens who approve of the monument and who believe that the prosperity of the region rests more securely on the tourists who visit the park and the monument than on the extremely limited grazing lands for stock.

One demonstration of this is that the Izaak Walton League was able to organize a flourishing chapter which is unalterably opposed to the abolition of the monument. Many of the businessmen of Jackson prefer the protection established by the monument to the unregulated conditions which prevailed before Mr. Rockefeller bought the menacing private lands. One of the greatest calamities that could happen to our region would be to have these Rockefeller lands revert to private ownership and the uncontrolled developments which are sure to grow up under such circumstances.

I can assure you that the pending bills in Congress to abolish the monument do not represent the sentiment of a majority of the citizens in the Jackson Hole Region. If the question of the future status of the Jackson Hole National Monument could be settled definitely, the Rockefeller lands would undoubtedly be turned over to the Federal Government for administration by the National Park Service. There would thus be assured the permanent protection of one of the finest scenes in America—the eastern slopes of the spectacular Grand Tetons and the flanking valley from which they can be seen. Those who walk or ride over the excellent trails in the park may thus look out over an unspoiled valley of real intrinsic beauty and see the sinuous Snake River as it winds its way through the hills and plains in the background. And always, like a silver chain, between the mountains and the valley, lies the glistening string of glacial lakes.

Is it not ironic that a small, persistent minority can so obstruct the final acts which would ensure the protection of this area for all time?

Editor's Note.—Mr. Burt spoke without notes and the foregoing account was prepared by a Reporter, as giving the gist of his remarks. Mr. Burt was introduced by Tom Wallace, former President of the Izaak Walton League; Chairman of the Board of the National Conference on State Parks; Vice-President of the American Planning and Civic Association; and Editor of the *Louisville Times*. Mr. Wallace testified to the size and activity of the Jackson Hole chapter of the Izaak Walton League. His paper, the *Louisville Times*, has given continuous support to the Jackson Hole National Monument.

WANTED: A NATIONAL LAND AND WATER POLICY

Saving the Nation's Soil

PAUL BESTOR, President, Friends of the Land, Newark, N. J.

AMERICAN people have finally awakened from their rosy dream of plenty to the realization that the natural resources of our great country are not inexhaustible, that the prodigious waste of productive soil, coupled with the failure to conserve our water supply, spells certain scarcity of food in this country unless immediate and drastic action is taken. This fast approaching shortage of food will be hastened by the rapid increase in our population. In the past eight years our population has increased by 14,000,000 people and all indications are that it will continue at about the same rate for many years to come.

Mr. Fairfield Osborn, in his recent book, "Our Plundered Planet," which I hope you have all read, calls attention to the rapidity with which the world population has increased during the last century and how certain it is that this increase will soon catch up with production. I am now talking about the whole world and not America, and it looks now as though America will have all it can do to feed itself within a few years without doing very much to help out the rest of the world.

Should there be the slightest doubt in your mind as to what the present situation is, you can find evidence from a thousand sources, as example we would call attention to the pronouncements by conservation leaders everywhere, the various pamphlets and brochures given out by large corporations all over the entire United States, magazine articles that are being printed concerning the matter and many other sources. Only a week or two ago there was an article in *Collier's*, which I am sure some of you saw, reciting the sad story of lower water tables and lowering of water, particularly in the West and Southwest. Statements were properly authoritative and were made to the effect that in many sections of the Southwest water was being used from wells as much as eighteen times as fast as it could possibly be replaced from rainfall and the water now available.

Insofar as the soil is concerned we are told that it takes from 100 to 300 years, and in some cases perhaps as much as 1,000 years, to replace one inch of top soil through Nature, whereas that amount of top soil can easily be destroyed in one short day if it happens to be in condition to be easily eroded and a deluge of rain comes along. So there is no possible question as to the present situation. The question is: Are we too late if we adopt all possible conservation methods? Will we be in time or will we be locking the door after the horse is stolen?

I do not believe that anyone knows the definite answer to that question. We do know, however, that if proper conservation methods are

used, if we can stop the raindrop where it falls and utilize it to the fullest extent, if we are willing to farm in such a way as to prevent soil and water erosion, if we are willing to utilize every plot of productive soil for a crop to which it is adapted, we can increase our present food production somewhere between 40 to 60 percent.

The late Dr. Leopold of the University of Wisconsin said shortly before his death: "So far, conservation has been mostly talk, for in spite of all that has been said and done, the information which we have is that only ten percent of our productive soil is farmed in accordance with best conservation methods."

This, you say, is all hysterical and scarehead propaganda. I only wish it were, but the statements made are based on cold, hard facts. You may not want to believe them but they are true nevertheless. That being the case, what is being done and what can be done about it? This group here is for the most part composed of urban people. You may wonder why we are talking to you about it. The reason is because you are just as much interested, and in some respects more so, than the people who actually live on the farms and operate them. You are interested not only as an individual for the sake of yourself, your children and your grandchildren; you are interested because of the threat to the very existence of the Nation itself.

Everyone knows that our ability to provide food for ourselves and our allies during the two World Wars was probably the determining factor in winning the wars. Our ability to produce sufficient food for ourselves and perhaps a little for the rest of the people who may be starving to death will go a long way toward winning the peace.

You cannot conceive of America winning another war without ample food supplies and we are not going to have those food supplies unless prompt and nationwide action is taken immediately. We cannot do a great deal about our increase in population; we cannot very well plow the babies under or shoot the older people. We are supposed to feed them and the question is, how?

As we have already indicated, progress with actual conservation practices has been very discouraging, but not entirely so. We have something to encourage us. The work of the Soil Conservation Districts is showing results. Many public and private organizations are working to the same end, and then there are the educational organizations such as Friends of the Land. The efforts of all of these are beginning to have results in the national thinking.

Several times during the last two or three years the President of the United States has stressed the urgent need for conservation of soil and water. The Secretary of Agriculture has also issued many warnings concerning the urgent need for conservation, and has made many constructive suggestions. Many members of Congress are aroused over the dangerous situation and urge passage of a National Land Use measure.

This is where you come into the picture. We cannot expect the Congress of the United States to pass legislation so far reaching and comprehensive as a National Land Policy Bill, without meeting a great deal of opposition, unless the public demands it. You cannot afford to leave it for the other fellow. If you do, it won't be done, but it must be done. Farmers are not going to adopt conservation practices in their farming unless they are convinced it is to their interest to do so or, of course, unless they are compelled to do so. If and when a scarcity of food actually develops, it is practically certain that the government will take over the farm land of the country, just as England has been compelled to do. Those of us who believe in free enterprise, and I take it that that takes in all of us, would not like to see that happen.

And now I am going to talk for a few minutes, before I close, concerning Friends of the Land. In its eight years of existence it has done everything it could to bring to the attention of as many people as possible the tragic state of affairs in this country, insofar as conservation of soil and water are concerned. Through our magazine *The Land*, which is ably edited, through our *Land Letters*, also ably edited, through our holding of clinics, our meetings of Chapters, our talks in schools and civic clubs, our cooperation with railroad sponsored conservation trips, and through our cooperation with all conservation agencies, both public and private, we have pushed and urged the development of a National Land Use Policy.

I am telling you this because it is possible that some of you present are not yet members of Friends of the Land.

I do not wish to stop without mentioning the health phase of this program because conservation includes not only the conservation of soil and water but conservation of man. Dr. Jonathan Forman and Louis Bromfield are telling everywhere of its tremendous importance. An annual Soil and Nutrition Conference is held each year in cooperation with the Ohio University at Athens, Ohio.

It all adds up to this, whether you are identified with Friends of the Land or some other conservation organization, or none at all, make it your business to see that the cause of conservation is brought to the attention of everyone possible. I wish to stress the fact that today is the time to act. People in all walks of life throughout the country are intensely interested in the problem. The psychology of the situation is perfect. We have been looking forward to just this opportunity. We can solve this problem easily if we have the full cooperation of everyone who knows about it. It is your job, and mine, to see that everybody does know about it.

If you favor a National Land and Water Policy it should be on your *must program*, and mine, to push for action.

Making the Most of the Nation's Waters

KENNETH A. REID, Executor Director of the Izaak Walton League of America, Chicago, Ill.

THE greatest need in the field of conservation today is a coordinated national water policy that would give proper consideration to the biology of water, to its scenic, esthetic and recreational values, to the whole public in its natural state, and the inherent right of the public to the use and enjoyment of these natural values. Our land management is not perfect, and it has its serious problems caused by the efforts of selfish, special-interest groups attempting to gain special advantages for themselves through unwise exploitation of forage, timber, or other resources of the Federal lands, which belong to all the people of the United States, but at least, our basic laws and administrative setups governing these lands are intended to protect the public interest.

But, with water, no such basic law or administrative policy for the protection of public values exists. On the contrary, the basic statutes give the green light to the exploitation of water for the benefit of special interests, so that the public in order to receive any protection is obliged to fight for it against rather serious odds.

For example, the Continental Congress recognized water transportation as the first use of water and that it should have the green light over all other uses. Such a policy was entirely proper in those days for, except for a few short roads east of the Alleghany Mountains, our inland rivers formed the only means of transportation over much of what is now the United States. Today, with the greatest system of roads and railroads paralleling practically all of our rivers and crossing our mountains and plains in an intricate network; with trains, trucks, busses and automobiles buzzing this way and that on the ground and airplanes soaring above; and with many of our existing improved waterways practically abandoned or only rarely used, as a result of this highly developed land transportation, this old green light for inland water transportation still remains on the statutes.

On the ocean, the Great Lakes, and the major rivers, which are normally navigable and only need minor alterations to make them navigable in fact, water transportation has a legitimate and proper place in the scheme of things. But it is high time that some of our mentors in Congress, who have been known to expound loudly about economy in government, examine some of their own inland waterway projects, and particularly some that are now on the planning board, in the light of sound economy. When they do and balance the actual tonnage carried against the capital cost, interest and maintenance involved in converting a non-navigable river into a navigable one, they will find that the so-called "cheap water transportation," in some cases, is actually the costliest form of transportation known to man, as well as the slowest.

Similarly, for irrigation the Reclamation Act authorizes the Commissioner of Reclamation with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to file upon any waters or lands for the so-called "higher use" of irrigation. And again, the same authority is given to the Federal Power Commission for the so-called "higher use" of hydro-power. This gives them the legal authority to go into our great national forests and impound and divert water for the so-called "higher uses" of irrigation and hydro-power. Nowhere in the basic law is there any recognition of true public values in water or protection to the public against such specialized uses and abuses.

Similarly, the western states' water laws treat water as a commodity to be appropriated, used, or consumed without any regard whatever for the value of a natural river to the whole public or the ill-effects of such appropriation and consumption on downstream users. Water laws in the West and the East are entirely different. In the East they are based on the old English, or sometimes called Virginia, law, which in substance says there is no property in water. It may be used as it passes through one's property, but it must be returned to the stream undiminished in quantity and unimpaired in quality. Would that that basic concept, particularly about the quality, were adhered to, but more of that later.

The provisions on water in the Colorado constitution are typical of many western States. This constitution recognizes water for three purposes and three purposes only, (1) for domestic use, (2) for agriculture use which means irrigation, and (3) for industrial use. The status of a stream or river, as such, has no legal standing, and it can, and is, often completely eliminated by irrigation or power diversions. Yet, the State of Colorado spends many thousands of dollars annually boasting about its natural beauties in which its trout streams are prominently featured as a lure for out-of-State tourists. It is somewhat ironical to use, as the cover design on the tourist booklet, a beautiful natural trout stream and fail to accord that trout stream any legal recognition or protection against oblivion.

The Izaak Walton League of America has long advocated a coordinated national water policy that would give consideration to all values existing and potential in advance of authorization or construction of any major river project. Specifically, we have advocated that there be comprehensive biological surveys on a par with, and at the same time as, the engineering surveys; that appropriations for engineering surveys be contingent upon the adequacy of appropriations for the corresponding biological surveys, and that both surveys be included in the report to Congress, giving Congress for the first time a full and complete balance sheet for an intelligent determination as to whether the project is or is not in the broad public interest. Furthermore, we have advocated that there be an impartial board of review including competent biologists, economists, and other scientists to make recom-

mendations to Congress on the findings of the surveys, instead of the present practice of having the interested proponents of the projects, such as the Chief of Engineers or the Commissioner of Reclamation, making such analyses and reports. It is only human nature that such interested parties cannot make wholly impartial or unbiased reports.

The first constructive step of any moment made toward the objective of a coordinated national water policy was the passage by the 79th Congress of Public Law 732 authorizing and requiring biological surveys along with the engineering surveys and including these surveys in the report to Congress. This is a real step in the right direction but there are two distinct weaknesses in its application. First, we find it necessary continually to remind not only the Corps of Engineers of the U. S. Army and the Bureau of Reclamation, but even Members of Congress, of the existence of this Act. Second, while continuing to make astronomical appropriations for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, running into the hundreds of millions, Congress has practiced penny-pinching economies on appropriations for the biological surveys it has authorized, despite the fact that these surveys are many years behind the engineering surveys already made. The biological surveys are so far behind the great mass of engineering surveys already made, that if appropriations for the latter were completely stopped, it would require the best part of a decade for the biological surveys to catch up. Under these conditions it seems utter folly for Congress to continue pouring out more money for more engineering surveys, but these pork-barrel projects apparently have a great appeal and the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, with their vast army of salesmen and promotors on the public payroll, have become the greatest means ever devised by man for filling the pork-barrel to the brim.

In order to get some idea of the amount of your money that Congress had committed in authorizations under the various river omnibus bills, I asked the Chairman of the House Public Works Committee for an estimate. After some investigation, he told me something over a year ago, that it looked like the total was in excess of six and one-half billion dollars; and no man, in or out of Congress, knows what they all are, where they all are, or what they will do.

Prior to fifteen years ago, the Izaak Walton League of America found itself in conflict with private power companies, which in their pursuit of hydro-power ignored the public values in a natural river, and quite frequently destroyed the most scenic parts of a river—the falls and rapids—with their impoundments and diversions. They naturally developed the better sites from a power standpoint and apparently have developed all they want, for private-company hydro applications are rare today. But in its place, government bureaucracies seem to have contracted that dangerous waterborne disease of *hydromania* that can see in a running stream only so many kilowatt hours going to waste and have gone

hog-wild in an attempt to develop every possible hydro-site without regard for national need, cost, or the natural values of a river that may be destroyed thereby. It is a deplorable situation when we have to fight our own government to prevent that government from wantonly destroying the natural rivers of America.

Similarly, the Bureau of Reclamation was created by act of Congress in 1902 to irrigate arid public lands so that these lands might support human life and be passed into private ownership. That job has long since been done, and for a number of years the Bureau has been irrigating private land at public expense. Yes, I know the Reclamation Fund is supposed to be a revolving fund, but it revolves so fast that nobody can ever pin it down. And the numerous bills that make their appearance in every Congress for the relief of this or that irrigation district extending the time of payment, charging off part of the principal, and in other ways saddling the cost on the whole public, is definite evidence that many irrigation projects of the past have not paid out, and those planned for the future are even more fantastic.

It stands to reason that after 46 years of scouring the country like a horde of locusts for every conceivable irrigation or power project—and the reclamation boys are in to the power game up to their neck as a means of perpetuating unsound irrigation projects—the best sites have already been developed and each year the remaining ones are more costly and less attractive.

As a matter of fact, the Bureau knows as well as we do that, with rare exceptions if any, the economically feasible irrigation sites that are able to stand on their own economic feet have already been developed, but with the characteristic and natural bureau attitude of self-perpetuation, it has put out an army of salesmen and promotors in the guise of engineers to work for the support of local communities who think they will be benefitted by the large expenditure of Federal funds in their community.

To illustrate this appeal, I want to quote the substance of Bill Findlay's talk before our national convention several years ago, when he was making an appeal against the construction of a number of proposed dams on the Willamette River in the name of flood control, which would have destroyed the runs of salmon and steelhead up that river. Bill said:

> You know the attitude of the average local Chamber of Commerce. It will ballyhoo for anything that it thinks will bring in some free Federal money into that community. And when they call it free, Federal money in Oregon, they are darn near right. Oregon has one million people, the United States has 130 million people. Therefore, the people of Oregon would pay only ¾ of one percent of this $58,000,000 and the rest of the United States would pay 99¾ percent. But I wish to hell you suckers would keep your money back east and let us keep our salmon out west.

That common attitude, which is a powerful motivating force behind many of these river development projects in the sparsely settled States

of the West, is one that should be considered carefully by the people of the populous eastern States who pay the bulk of this pork-barrel bill.

But the Bureau of Reclamation has met the issue of diminishing returns in another way. Along with the Corps of Engineers it has adopted the very convenient label of *multiple-purpose* dams in order to bolster up on paper an unsound project that cannot stand on its own economic feet. Three hundred to five hundred dollars per acre, and even more, is not unusual as a capital cost to put water on land in many of the present fantastic irrigation proposals. Even the Continental Divide is no barrier to ambitious engineers looking for new worlds to conquer. In fact, it seems to intrigue their imagination and whet their interest if it becomes necessary to pump water uphill and then tunnel it through the Continental Divide to make it flow down the other side.

The label of *multiple-purpose dams* is most convenient for the type of bookkeeping required to make an economically unsound irrigation project look plausible. If we charge off 25 percent of the cost of the project to hydro-power (even though the power generated may be largely used to pump the water uphill), another 20 percent to navigation benefits (which may be purely fanciful), and about 30 percent to that convenient catch-all, flood control, it is quite possible to make an utterly absurd irrigation project look feasible—and that is the principal value of the multiple-purpose dam.

Theoretically, one dam can serve all these purposes but from a practical standpoint, each one would have to sacrifice so much that it would be of little value to any. Actually, some of these uses are diametrically opposed to each other, so that Bill Vogt's term of *cross-purpose dam* more aptly describes them.

For instance, for irrigation the idea is to divert the water out of the stream onto the land; for navigation the idea is to get all of the water into the main channel so that it can float the boats. For flood control, the idea is to keep the dam as nearly empty as nearly all the time as possible, so that it will have the capacity to catch the flood waters; for hydro-power, you want to keep the dam as nearly full as nearly all the time as possible so that it will have both the head and volume to generate power. And in the so-called *multiple-purpose dam* public values in water always come in for last consideration for whatever is left.

The Izaak Walton League is not opposed to large dams *per se* but insists that the proponents of these projects put out all the facts instead of the fanciful propaganda that suits their purpose, while carefully hiding the liabilities of the project. A large dam may be either a public asset or a public liability depending upon a lot of factors. First and foremost is the consideration: What is the value of the river in its natural state? Is it a clear, perennial stream, high in biologic, scenic and esthetic values, or is it a muddy, silt-ladened stream very low in the scale? In the latter case, the large impoundment would destroy little or nothing

and can be expected to create new values far exceeding the old, at least from a fisheries standpoint. But, in the former case, such an evaluation does not follow, and it is the attempt of the great dam builders to use one formula for all rivers that leads to such fallacious conclusions. It isn't safe to generalize on the effects of dams. Because a large dam on a muddy stream in Texas or Oklahoma, originally containing only cat fish, may replace that with more and better fishing for largemouth bass in the reservoir created, it does not follow that a similar reservoir on a fine trout river in the mountains of Montana will show even a remotely similar balance sheet between new values created *versus* old values eliminated. The common assumption of the great dam builders and their supporting pressure groups that the mere impoundage of water will increase the desirable fishing in proportion to the increased area is entirely erroneous.

For the purpose of illustration, even though exceptions must be made to all generalizations, let's take the Missouri River. Shortly after the river gets away from the mountains, it becomes a muddy, silt-ladened stream, known to the early explorers as the *Big Muddy*. But the headwaters of the Missouri include some of the finest clear trout rivers on the continent. If we draw a line across the Missouri at Great Falls and the Yellowstone at Billings, we can say, in general, that any dams constructed on the main stem below these points, or on most of the tributaries, will do little harm to fisheries because there is little to destroy, and on the other hand, may be expected to create more and better fishing than existed in the natural state. On the other hand, most large impoundments that might be built above these two points, would destroy important natural values that would not be adequately compensated for by any new values created, especially when we consider the diversions that are so common with such impoundments. The examples of the latter are the Reclamation Bureau's proposal for the so-called Wilson Dam in the Sun River Wilderness area; the long diversion of water from the famous Madison River and the several dams proposed on the upper Gallatin River.

When we analyze the Missouri proposals, practically all the conflict is caused by a distinct minority of the projects on these upper waters. The basic trouble is the *sacred-cow* concept of irrigation, persistently held by the Bureau of Reclamation and its supporting pressure groups, which holds that absolutely nothing must be permitted to interfere with the maximum potential development of irrigation. The fight is not with legitimate irrigation but with the fanatical variety that would squeeze the last acre foot of water out of the last river on the *sacred-cow* concept, with utter disregard for the destruction of outstanding natural values in the process.

There is hardly a river in the country that is not threatened with major surgery in the plans of the great concrete pourers. Here are just

a few examples: the Gunnison River of Colorado is one of the Nation's most famous trout rivers. For many years the attraction of fishermen has constituted the principal revenue of the valley. Some years ago, the Salt Lake Regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation succeeded in building a large dam on the Taylor River, one of the head forks of the Gunnison, on the plea that the Uncompaghre Valley and other down-river irrigation areas on the western slope needed more water than the river normally flowed. In recent years, the Denver office of the Bureau has been promoting a gigantic dam near Sapinero which would flood the valley almost up to the town of Gunnison, from which the water would be pumped uphill, through a 21-mile tunnel through the Continental Divide to flow down the Arkansas on the eastern slope. And the plea this time is that the water on the western slope is surplus! One claim or the other is definitely wrong. They can't both be right.

No one knows what the acre cost would be for putting this western slope water on the eastern slope. Estimates have run well in excess of $1,000 per acre. Certainly the cost would be fantastic and much more than the land could actually carry. Yet, the effort to build this project, over all objections, persists undiminished.

Another outstanding illustration is the famous Rogue River of Oregon, perhaps the world's most famous steelhead sport fishing stream. Recognizing this value, the State of Oregon has prohibited all commercial netting in the Rogue. Now the Bureau of Reclamation comes along with an ambitious plan that would absolutely block off the essential spawning runs of salmon and steelhead in this famous stream—and the Army Engineers have their separate plan, and either one alone would exterminate the salmon and steelhead of the Rogue. These are just two of the dozens or hundreds of similar examples that might be cited. It is time that the American public rises up and demands that this extravagant and destructive racket be stopped, and that henceforth, river development projects be rationalized to consider all values.

If you think I am unduly alarmed you should take a look at the President's budget. In the face of the obvious need for economy and for avoiding government construction projects which compete for essential materials in short supply, the recommended increase alone to the Bureau of Reclamation is nearly $126,000,000, and the increase alone to the Corps of Engineers $247,000,000. The total recommended budget for the two Bureaus is nearly a billion dollars.

Now let's compare this with the true conservation activities of the Federal Government, in view of all the talk in Washington on conservation of natural resources. The combined budget of all the five conservation bureaus, namely, the U. S. Forest Service, National Park Service, Soil Conservation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Land Management, is just under $140,000,000. The mere increase for Reclamation is almost equal to, and the increase for the Corps of En-

gineers is $108,000,000 in excess of, the combined budgets of all five conservation bureaus.

If Congress means what it says about economy and is not merely picking at the bed covers, it will drop the economy axe here where it will do some good. The trouble is that too many Congressmen and Senators, while talking about economy for the other fellow, have their own pet projects, and in order to get them through, they vote for the other fellow's in a giant river omnibus bill including them all.

The real solution of this problem lies with Congress. It is only human nature that the Bureaus, as long as they can get Congress to appropriate the money, will continue surveying new projects to keep themselves feeding at the public trough. The only way this self-perpetuating racket will ever be stopped is to cut the purse strings. To this end we suggest the following program:

1. Amend the basic laws which presently give the green light to irrigation, navigation, and hydro-power.

2. Declare a moratorium on further engineering surveys for new projects until the biological surveys required by Public Law 732 of the 79th Congress can catch up with the great number of engineering surveys already made, and abolish project planning activities of the bureaus for the same period.

3. Re-examine in the light of Public Law 732 the vast backlog of authorizations previously made without benefit of biological surveys.

4. Confine appropriations during the above moratorium to construction and completion of projects already under construction, thereby saving the vast and needless expense of additional project planning and new engineering surveys, which constitute the camel's nose in the tent and the foot in the door.

5. Authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service, in cooperation with the respective state conservation departments, to make a general survey of America's rivers as a basis for classifying those in which the natural scenic, esthetic, recreational and aquatic values are of paramount importance to the American public, and on which no large dams or diversions which would impair those values would be permitted.

6. Oppose in principle trans-mountain diversions where the water for irrigation is forever lost to the watershed of its origin.

Such a program would serve the dual purpose of sound water management and sound fiscal economy.

Water is truly the orphan of the whole natural resource family. In addition to its abuse for special interest use, for irrigation, navigation, and hydro-power, to say nothing of certain flood control and drainage practices, we have the wide-spread abuse of pollution which threatens not only the health of the citizens but the continued existence of many communities and industries.

After 12 years of effort and wrangling before Committees of the National Congress between conservation organizations, which contended that some actual Federal control of pollution was necessary, and State Health officers, Sanitary Engineers, representatives of interstate compacts, and similar organizations favoring only study research and financial assistance without actual Federal control authority, agreement

was finally reached in 1947 on the following essential principles to be embodied in any anti-pollution Bill enacted by Congress:

1. A ban on the spread of pollution from new outlets, so that the line may be held while the corrective measures provided by the Bill are applied to existing pollution;

2. While fully recognizing the primary responsibility and authority of the States to control their own pollution, there must be adequate Federal control in the background to be invoked if and when the State has demonstrated either its inability or unwillingness to do its own job;

3. If the Bill provides Federal financial assistance there should be some clear definition of policy in the Bill to the effect that compliance with the provisions of the Act shall not be contingent upon current availability of Federal financial assistance.

On July 17, 1947, the Senate passed S-418 and sent it over to the House Committee on Public Works, but only after some major amendments that weakened it considerably. The Bill, as passed by the Senate, did not include either the first or third of the agreed minimum essentials, and the second, the Federal control, was badly hamstrung by a proviso forbidding the Federal authority coming into any State, or into any area under the jurisdiction of any interstate compact, even after these agencies had demonstrated either their inability or unwillingness to correct their own pollution, without first receiving the consent from either the State or the interstate compact. Obviously, if either state agency was doing a good job in correcting its own pollution there would be no need for the Federal authority, and obviously, where the Federal authority is most needed is where either the State or the interstate compact has failed in its own job. It is these very do-nothing States and interstate compacts which have objected most strongly to any vestige of Federal control and therefore, would refuse the needed consent under the terms of S-418 to get the job done.

Early this year, the subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, under the chairmanship of Congressman Auchincloss of New Jersey, was assigned the job of considering S-418 and four House Bills on the same subject, by Mundt, Spence and Elston. In view of the preponderance of testimony favoring an effective pollution control Bill, there was every reason to expect that the Committee, if it paid any attention to the testimony and the evident public need for pollution abatement, would bring out an effective Bill. Instead, on April 27, 1948, the Public Works Committee of the House approved S-418, after making further weakening amendments which make it a perfect polluters' protective measure which can by no stretch of the imagination be expected to achieve the avowed objective.

In Section 1 of the Bill, under the congressional declaration of policy, the following new wording is added: "to support and aid technical research to devise and perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes which are not susceptible to known effective methods of treatment." Elsewhere in the Bill the same language is inserted to saddle the respon-

sibility for discovery and development of treatment methods on State Governments, as well as the Federal Government, and throughout the Bill the word *research* has been added to complete the job of transferring this responsibility from the industries creating the pollutants, to the Federal and State Governments. And to complete this travesty on justice, a final amendment was adopted authorizing an appropriation of $800,000 a year for five years to construct a Government pollution research laboratory on the Ohio River.

It might be well for economy-minded Congressmen and Senators to look into the tons of unused reports of studies and investigations on water pollution, including an elaborate one on the Ohio River, made by the Corps of Engineers and the U. S. Public Health Service only a few years ago, at a cost to the taxpayers of the Nation of over $600,000. *No more unwise policy could be incorporated in Federal Legislation than to transfer from industry to the Federal and State Governments the responsibility for discovery and development of industrial waste treatment methods.*

In commenting on this matter 24 years ago, the late Dr. Henry Baldwin Ward, eminent scientist and specialist on water pollution, said, in substance:

> When one approaches an industry about correcting its pollution, a common reply is, 'Well, you tell us how to do it and then we'll consider whether we will do it.' No attitude could be more unreasonable.
>
> Where is the greatest knowledge of the chemistry of oil? Why, in the chemists and engineers of the great oil companies, of course. Where is the greatest know-how in the intricate manufacturing process of converting chunks of wood into fine paper? Why, in the chemists and engineers of the great pulp and paper companies and their industrial associations.
>
> The variety and complexity of industrial wastes is so great and so constantly changing that no Governmental agency, however learned, or however well financed, could begin to approximate the wealth of information on industrial waste treatment methods that is already in the possession of the industries themselves, but largely unused because they are not obliged to use it. If we ever once allow the responsibility for discovery and development of industrial-waste-treatment methods to be transferred from industry, where it belongs, to Government, where it does not belong, the whole cause of pollution abatement will be lost, because recalcitrant industries will then have a perfect alibi to do nothing until Government, at great and needless expense and after years of duplication of effort, is able to show industry the treatment methods, which in the great majority of cases were well-known to industry long before.

S-418, as mutilated by the House Public Works Committee, is an excellent protective measure for recalcitrant industrial polluters in that it would give, at the very minimum, a five-year moratorium (while the Government wasted public funds in trying to learn what the big industries already know about waste treatment processes). It would indeed constitute a great victory for continuance of unrestrained water pollution and a great set-back in the application of needed pollution abatement measures. And, ironically, it would spend $126,500,000 of the taxpayers' money to perpetrate on the public this five-year moratorium to polluters.

In the fact of all the talk in Congress about economy and the need for checking expanding bureaucracy, such a study-spend Bill that would merely build up new bureaucracy while continuing the national disease of water pollution, is an insult to the intelligence of every decent citizen.

No subject under the sun has been so investigated to death as the subject of water pollution. We know that water pollution is a national and increasing evil, gnawing at both the health and the economic base of the Nation. We know what it is; we know where it is; and, in the great majority of cases, we know how to correct it. The need is not for more investigation and research, but for a forth-right attack on the problem that will cause to be used the vast mass of material already available for its correction. When that happens, you will be surprised how quickly many *unsolved problems* will be solved—and in some cases the recovery of valuable by-products from treatment processes will cover and even exceed the cost of treatment.

To this end, if the Congress is to consider the abortion that emerged from the House Public Works Committee, it must be amended as follows: (1) Strike out the language transferring to Government and absolving industry from its responsibility for discovery and development of treatment methods; (2) insert a simple provision that will outlaw the spread of pollution from new outlets; (3) delete the State consent requirement from the Federal control provision. (These essentials are found in both Mundt Bills, HR3990 and HR123.)

Without at least the first two of the above amendments S-418 should be opposed by every decent citizen as a deliberate attempt to administer a dose of soothing syrup to the public, while actually insuring the continuance of the evil the public wants corrected.

The argument of "getting something on the books" is invalid when that "something" is a definite step the wrong way.

Without Conservation We Perish

BERNARD DE VOTO, Editor of the Easy Chair, *Harper's Magazine*

THEODORE ROOSEVELT was one President who left a fine heritage to the American people in the field of conservation. In 1908 he called to the White House a Conference of Governors on the Conservation of Natural Resources. Many good results came from that conference but not enough. In the past forty years we may point to many sins of commission and omission on the part of successive administrations at Washington and on the part of the State Governments. It is true that in all but the so-called 11 public-land States, the Federal Government has only such national forests, national parks or other Federal reservations as it has purchased or received by gift. But in the West the national forests were created to conserve through wise use the forest crop and the national parks were created by Congress to preserve superlative scenic and historic areas in their natural state. The remnant of the public domain, which consisted of the areas unsuitable for settlement, was for many years utterly neglected and left open for free and uncontrolled use by the stockmen. Finally grazing districts were set up which provided for a measure of regulation.

But the stockmen who want to put more animals to graze in the national forests and public domain than the cover will support are trying to break down the safeguards that have been established by the Federal Government. While the American public takes for granted that these lands are protected by the Federal Government, the stockmen slumber not nor sleep. The attack on the public lands is going on all the time. Thus we have the proposals to transfer public domain and even parts of the national forests and national parks to the States and even to authorize sales of land outright to the stockmen.

The statements of the various candidates for the Presidency during recent months are not very reassuring for the future of our natural resources. It is easy to promise the Western States that they will be relieved of the burden placed upon them by the immense holdings of the Federal Government. But anyone who knows at what cost the present conservation policies of the Federal Government have been won and anyone who believes that the State Governments can resist the immediate pressures for over-use of public lands is credulous indeed.

We need a revision of our public land policy. But mere general statements to this effect by the politicians who will be touring the West could result in a serious blow to conservation. When the new administration comes in—when any new administration comes in—there are six keymen who could bring about a total change in our public land policies which might mean rapid deterioration of our forests and grazing lands. These are: the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the chairmen of the House and Senate Public Lands Committees and

the chairmen of the House and Senate subcommittees for Appropriations for Agriculture and Interior. These six men can completely reverse the historic public lands policies of the United States and the five conservation bureaus could completely achieve their objectives.

This calamity could happen if we, the American people, are not on the alert to protect our possessions from exploitation. We should know the detailed views and convictions of candidates for the Presidency and we should keep in close touch with key Members of Congress to make sure that our heritage is not sold for a mere mess of pottage.

But, I am glad to say that there are encouraging gains in some places. In Davis County in my home State of Utah, we have had to learn by bitter experience. Entire valleys have been destroyed by short-sighted cattle and sheep grazing policies and by devastating lumber policies. In Utah it has been necessary to move populations in order that these areas could be prevented from deteriorating farther—in order that they could be restored. The over-use of the land has been brought about in part by the policy of keeping the family together so that the farm homesteads must support four, five and six families where once they supported a single family. This means that in the third generation there are so many more cattle and sheep. Lands that blossomed as the rose twenty-five years ago are now often eroded and less fertile than when they supported fewer people.

At the end of the 18th century, Malthus called our attention to increasing populations and lower food supplies. But economists during the 19th Century pointed out that populations had increased and that the standard of living had steadily risen. Now the promissory notes of the 19th Century are being called all over the world. For we have made drastic inroads into the capital represented by our natural resources.

During the 1920's there was in Utah an agricultural strip of land at the foot of the Wasatch Mountains, five miles wide, in some places not over two miles wide, and perhaps 36 miles long from north to south. During the 1920's flash floods from the surrounding valleys brought down a deposit of sediment which made cultivation of this once-fertile valley utterly impossible. The good soil was buried under rocks weighing sometimes five tons and debris five feet deep, sweeping across irrigation ditches and highways. The disaster destroyed important crops and made it impossible for that land ever again to be farmed. The destruction of the land meant that the people moved away, banks closed. Relief measures had to be taken. This was a great object lesson.

We have seen, too, that dangerous grazing policies on the watersheds will result in floods which damage agriculture. Under the U. S. Forest Service, soil conservation practices have been put into effect. The Soil Conservation Service is doing valuable work in educating farmers. But even in 1933–34, the program then inaugurated was immediately successful, as proved when one of the heaviest rains ever recorded in Utah

resulted in no damage by flood. Even with partly completed measures, disastrous floods were prevented.

In Salt Lake City there is a small creek where there was a terrific flood causing hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of damage in the city. In Ogden there is a small mountain four miles from the center of the city where there was a flood damaging power lines and tying up the irrigation system on which all crops depended. It was, of course, one of the most dramatic demonstrations of damage resulting from unprotected watersheds, due to over-grazed ranges. The U. S. Forest Service and the Grazing Service always stand ready to provide the knowledge to local business men and farmers as to how to protect themselves and the public.

There is a broader hope for the privately owned lands in the West than you can believe when you see the damages inflicted, because we have the expert service on which to call if we will only avail ourselves of the help we can command.

But there is no denying that the crisis in conservation is here now. There is a planned, intensive campaign on now against the public preserves. Pressure is being exerted to force a revision in public land-use policies. Any change in the present conservation policies means destruction of the public lands which are now protected by well recognized public policies. If we allow our forests and grazing cover to be depleted and so reduce our natural resources, the United States of America will be following the pattern under which the great civilizations of the past ceased to exist.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. De Voto spoke extemporaneously. The foregoing written account was prepared by a Reporter from rough notes.

Attention is called to the recent Report on *National Forest and Public Land Policies*, issued in August by the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives, in which the Committee did indeed recommend that the Federal Government should retain ownership of national forests because of "their tremendous importance to the Nation as a whole," but in which the pressure for more intensive use of the national forests for grazing can be seen in the proposed program. It is recommended that the forest act be amended to make grazing, recreation and wild life *basic uses* of national forest lands; that advisory boards on national forests be given legal status; that the policy of making cuts in grazing permits made upon change of ownership be discontinued; that the Forest Service, in addition to a program for range improvement, enable grazing permittees to "participate in and contribute to" an extended range improvement program. In view of the public criticism of the effectiveness of grazing regulations on the public domain, due to the *undue influence* of the local advisory boards, who can suppose that the grazing regulations in effect under the U. S. Forest Service, intended to conserve range cover, would not, under such local advisory boards, be relaxed to meet the demands of the stockmen?

Discussion

HENRY H. JAMES, Administrative Director, Palisades Interstate Park Commission, Bear Mountain, N. Y., *Reporter*

THIS meeting was called to order by Mr. Horace M. Albright, Chairman of the Board, American Planning and Civic Association, New York.

Mr. Albright stressed the present threat to public lands, particularly

in the Western States. This threat comes both from commercial interests and other Governmental agencies. An excellent example is the Army Engineer's Glacier View Project. This would destroy 12,000 acres of Glacier National Park. The Chairman's remarks were a timely prelude to the three speeches that followed.

Mr. Paul Bestor's paper on "Saving the Nation's Soil" and Mr. Kenneth E. Reid's on "Making the Most of the Nation's Waters" were frank and to the point and were well received.

Mr. Bernard DeVoto summed up the entire subject in his excellent talk, *ie.*, "Without Conservation We Perish." "The Crisis on Conservation is here now, not something to expect or try to avoid in the future," he said. "There is a planned and intensive campaign on now against Public Preserves. The attack is going on from day to day. Pressure is on to force a revision in Public Land Use Policies. Any change in the present policy means destruction of public lands."

Mr. DeVoto cited some instances of short-sighted Conservation Policies. He mentioned the overgrazing and lumbering activities in Verad Valley, Utah, as a good example of the over-usage of the land. Davis County in Utah was mentioned as a case where overgrazing and lumbering had made the valley worthless. The people of the valley combined to restore it. Rigid grazing rules were set up and enforced. The same was done for lumbering and today Davis County is again being restored to its original fertility.

Mr. Tom Wallace led the discussion which followed. He mentioned the fact that high school students of Newark had attended most of the sessions, which was an excellent sign of interest in conservation on the part of the young people. A thought was proposed that some of the money appropriated for multiple use dams be diverted to highway repairs and construction. The question was asked as to the need of some of these dams at the sites proposed. Mr. Reid answered that dams properly placed did a lot of good in flood control and irrigation—dams built on silt laden rivers and not on clear mountain streams. The dams along the Tennessee River are mostly this type and have improved conditions.

Mr. Reid said that multiple use dams are not as inclusive in their effect as is claimed, because water storage for flood control and power are diametrically opposed. This term is mostly used to make a project seem financially sound.

Mr. Reid also suggested that all streams where projects for dams are considered, be given a biological survey, and that all Engineering surveys be stopped until these biological surveys could be completed.

The suggestion was made from the floor that rivers be surveyed archeologically.

The Big Thompson Project was discussed at length. From the discussion, there seemed to be a possibility that this project would do more harm than good. The cost is enormous and still going up.

IN THE STATES

STATE PLANNING

Land Planning in New Jersey

RUSSELL VANNEST BLACK, Planning Consultant, New Hope, Pa.

IT CAN be said without much fear of contradiction that New Jersey has more municipalities, more planning boards and, almost, more people, per square inch, than any other State in the Union. For its small size, it is a State of great contrasts. Nearly a third of the State's area is densely urbanized. Another third has a population density of less than 5 persons per square mile. Containing some of the Nation's most productive farm lands, and long known as The Garden State, nearly two-fifths of its land, two-and-a-half million acres, is agriculturally submarginal.

The State's 7500-odd square miles is broken into 566 municipalities enjoying, under the statutes, equal privileges in planning and in most other governmental matters. Local autonomy comes to full flower in the metropolitan counties. Camden County's 36 cities, townships, and boroughs boast an average area of 6.2 square miles; Essex County's 22 municipalities have an average size of 5.8 square miles; while Bergen County tops the list with an average 3.4 square miles for its 70 municipalities. This may indicate greater cause for confusion than is the fact. Generally, a corporation-limit sign marks the transition from one governmental jurisdiction to that of another. Sometimes,—there is a shift in street alignment or, perhaps, a change in the condition of the pavement. It *is* possible, if keeping reasonably alert and by a few timely questions, for even a total stranger to know when he has reached the confines of West Orange, Bloomfield or Union City.

At one time or another, most everybody and a great many of his or her possessions pass through or over the State of New Jersey. It is a regional and national transportation corridor. All the railroads from the South, and all but one from the West must cross the State to reach Manhattan Island. Across the State must flow all the highway traffic between New York and Philadelphia, and most of the traffic from the South and West. And down through or across the State must move all the pleasure-bound traffic to the Jersey Shore.

New Jersey has the further distinctions of providing a spare building lot for every family; of having many superlative highways but no parkways or freeways; of having some of the country's most polluted waterways; of having a hundred and twenty-eight miles of fine ocean front but no seashore parks; of having perhaps less park and playground acreage per thousand inhabitants than any other comparable area in the United States; and of ranking at or near the top in municipal tax rates.

None of this is said to besmirch the fair name of the State. I speak rather as a native Jerseyite having a natural pride in the State's good qualities and its accomplishments, and with some proper sense of responsibility for its deficiencies. And my intention is to point up the price the State is now paying for having planned so little or so badly during earlier years,—the great need for planning now,—and some of the peculiar difficulties of doing an effective planning job in the face of unusually complex circumstances.

That there is a wide-spread and increasing awareness of the need for and advantages of planning, in the State, is evidenced by the recent and current planning activities at all levels of government,—activities supported by a full range of enabling legislation. The State's planning and zoning statutes could be improved, and improvement is in process, but as they stand they compare favorably with the legislation of most other States. All municipalities are given equal, and for the most part, adequate planning and zoning authority. Counties are given adequate planning powers but no zoning authority because of prior grant of that authority to their component municipalities. Any number of neighboring municipalities or counties or counties and municipalities may join to create regional planning boards vested with any or all the powers and duties available to individual county or municipal planning boards. The State was among the first to adopt state planning legislation and has maintained its state planning operation continuously since 1934, shifting from a state-planning-board to a departmental organization of the work in 1943 without detriment, and probably with some gain, to this important function.

Four years ago none of the State's cities with a population of 100,000 or more had an active planning board. Now, all are either engaged in intensive planning programs or are reportedly about to do so. Of the State's 566 municipalities, 165 have planning boards serving 66 percent of the State's population. And a score of additional boards are in process of organization. Two hundred and seventy-two municipalities, representing 83 percent of the State's population, are zoned. Eight of the twenty-one counties have planning boards.

Not bad! But not too good, either, if scratching below the surface. All but thirty-five of the hundred and sixty-five planning boards have been in existence more than three years and yet only sixty-nine report having prepared comprehensive plans, and many of these plans are of ancient vintage and are probably quite obsolete. Of the 272 zoning ordinances, it is obvious that over 200 must have been prepared without benefit of over-all planning study and are to that extent deficient. Many of the ordinances date back to the twenties, and seventy-five of them are reported to be out of date. Probably, a great majority of all the ordinances would benefit from more or less extensive modernization. Of the eight county planning boards, only two have prepared what might

properly be called over-all development plans. No group of municipalities or counties has yet taken advantage of the statutory authority to organize a joint or regional planning board, an instrumentality that should be particularly effective in the State's extensive metropolitan areas.

A principal deterrent to planning board action and accomplishment has been insufficiency of funds, although in this, there has been some improvement during very recent years. Total county planning appropriations were increased from $32,000 in 1946 to $40,000 in 1947, but three of the boards still had no funds and no staff. Total municipal funds of planning boards were increased from $96,190 in 1945 to $167,125 in 1947, but $147,875 of this amount went to 22 boards leaving the other 143 boards with exactly $134.61 each. In this respect, it may be that New Jersey isn't much worse off than some other States except in the number of barren boards. There still persists too generally the notion that a planning board can produce without tools.

Perhaps of greater general interest than local planning activities in New Jersey, because more unusual, is the work of the State Division of Planning and Engineering, the successor to the State Planning Board. Within the year, the State Division has completed, and held regional hearings upon, its first draft of a State Master Plan.

This Plan, begun by the State Planning Board, has proceeded through several stages. Its groundwork was prepared through the thirties by a long series of general and specific studies of the State's resources, problems, prospects and needs. In 1941 the State Planning Board completed and presented the first phase of the Plan,—"A Parks and Public Lands Plan and Program," prepared and sponsored by a special committee representing seven state departments and agencies. It was subsequently officially adopted by the State Department of Conservation and Development as a guide and goal for that Department's future land acquisition and improvement program.

The Park and Public Lands Plan envisioned, among other things, the ultimate acquisition by the State of approximately a million acres of land to be used for the multiple purposes of recreation, water-shed protection, institutional grounds, and timber production. Criteria in selecting the indicated taking areas included unique scenic and recreational values, submarginality of the land for agricultural or other economic use higher than that proposed for it under public ownership and management. The quality of soils, the relative prospects for rural, nonfarm development and the incidence of chronic tax delinquency were among the factors used in determining land submarginality.

Among the principal features of the Plan were: a chain of seashore parks and reservations; lands giving improved accessibility to inland waters like the coastal bays and the Delaware River; large sections of the pine-lands; a number of the mountainous ridges and valleys in the

northern part of the State; and a great playground on the Hackensack Meadows, in the midst of the North Jersey metropolitan area, to compensate in part for the very serious recreational deficiencies of that densely populated district. And supplementing the Plan were a number of proposed scenic roads and parkways, the most notable of which would extend along the Delaware River from Trenton to the northernmost tip of the State, at Port Jervis. Everybody agreed it was a pretty good Plan. Nobody has yet succeeded in doing much toward its accomplishment.

The next step in development of the State Master Plan was completing the picture for major highways and parkways, navigable waterways, water reservoir sites, and airports. Again the job became a cooperative one. The Planning Division of the State Highway Department was simultaneously preparing a long-range state highway plan. A succession of conferences between the engineers of the two agencies was effective in reconciling all essential differences so that the two plans became one. The airport phase of the Plan, likewise, was produced through many give-and-take discussions,—this time with the Federal aeronautic authorities, the State Department of Aviation, and special New York and Philadelphia regional committees. Other departments and agencies respectively concerned were drawn into consultation on the remaining parts of the Plan. And then, the whole plan was submitted to review by a committee comprising representation from all the directly-interested state agencies,—the object being throughout all this procedure to come out with one state plan, fundamentally acceptable to all the action agencies having responsibility for the execution of any part thereof. It would appear that this has been achieved, at least for the time being. There is no expectation but that, as time goes on, the ground will occasionally shift, new and better ideas will be produced, circumstances and requirements will change, and the Plan will and should be adjusted and improved accordingly.

This is the State Master Plan as tentatively prepared and approved by the state agencies. It remains to be reconciled with the views of the localities and of the Legislature. Already mentioned are the regional hearings on the Plan, held by the State Division of Planning in various parts of the State, at which hearings regional representatives were invited to criticise the Plan and to organize regional committees for more detailed study of it. This final review of the Plan is still in process.

The law of state planning in New Jersey provides that, following public hearings on the State Master Plan, the Plan may be submitted to the Legislature for official adoption. Whether it would be wise or gainful to place such an official stamp upon such a long-range plan is still to be decided. It may be better, as is generally the case with city master plans, to retain the State Master Plan in its present, elastic and easily-adjustable form, and to seek legislative approval, from time to time of only those parts of the Plan considered to be most imminent.

The State Master Plan still lacks certain features which may desirably be added if and when decisions in respect to them are reached. They include things like possible improvements in rail-transportation facilities, port and harbor developments and terminal facilities.

A special Land-Use Advisory Committee, attached to the State Division of Planning and Engineering, is now engaged in more detailed land-use studies concerned primarily, at the present time, with potential industrial lands. The findings and recommendations of this Committee may occasion some adjustments in the over-all State Plan.

I have dwelt at such length upon the state-wide aspect of planning in New Jersey because I think that the State Master Plan, even in its present somewhat crude and incomplete form, represents a notable achievement among the States. It is quite true that, being of comparatively small size and highly urbanized, New Jersey may be somewhat more adaptable to this expression and development of state planning than are many other parts of the country. And yet, I still hold to the general principle that any unit of government, no matter what its size or nature, can with advantage prepare and maintain a master plan for the long-range development of at least those public facilities and improvements for which that government is responsibile and over which it has whole or partial jurisdiction.

State Constitutional Provisions for Planning

SPENCER MILLER, JR., New Jersey State Highway Commissioner

PLANNING, which is sometimes presented as a new idea in the American scene, is in reality an old technique which goes back to the very beginnings of our Republic. Indeed, if one turns to our Colonial history and to the great design of the Mayflower Compact we discover that the idea of planning ran through the provisions of that historic document. The broad provisions of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself represent in the realm of political science, planning in the grand manner. Washington's concluding words at the Constitutional Convention of 1785—"Let us raise a standard to which the wise may repair," expresses the concept in immortal language.

But the significant thing to remember is that historically the States are older than the Federal Union; that State government is older than Federal government. Certain ideas, therefore, for planning which are to be found in the outline and structure of our Federal Constitution derive directly from the earlier State Constitutions and Colonial Charters.

In recent years the movement for Constitutional revision has brought into focus the importance of written Constitutions in providing the design of a free society. A constitution is the fundamental law of a free people. It is the embodiment of principles, the guarantee of civil liberties, the division of powers and the outline of procedures for government which rests upon persuasion and consent.

In America the development of constitutional government has been a part of the epic of our quest for liberty and our determination that in this land all men should be privileged to live and work together in ordered freedom. It has been a great dream, the complete realization of which will be the labor of a long age.

A study, then, of planning in State Constitutions may properly consider first planning generally in the American tradition, and secondly, planning as spelled out in the constitutions of the several States. Contrary to current belief, but consistent with a thoughtful reading of our history, planning has its roots in the very beginnings of the Colonial settlements of the New World.

Prior to the general migration of the Puritans from England to the New World in 1631, there was a tract prepared largely by John Winthrop entitled, "General Observations" which sought to outline a plan for living in the New World. This tract compares the "unused advantages of a new continent 'fruitful and convenient for the use of men'" with a crowded England "grown weary with its inhabitants;" and outlines as the double objective colonization in accordance with both "moral and natural law." This tract further provides for the general organization

of the undertaking including the collection of a common fund for the general purposes of settlement. Without dwelling in detail on these early plans it is sufficient to add that they provided the basis for building communities in the New World which combined private enterprise within their bounds of a free society. One of the significant surviving witnesses of that early system of planning was The Town Common, to be found in many a New England Village. This area used originally both as common pasturage and drill ground for the local militia, has in our time served as a part of the stimulus of the Town Planning movement which has sought to assert the privacy of the common interest in the use of urban land.

The government of the Territory of the United States northwest of the River Ohio commonly known as the "Ordinance of 1787" is another such early example. There was set forth a gridiron pattern of local units and highways and the setting aside of certain public lands for education which is the essence of planning. "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind shall forever be encouraged" begins Article III of the compact. But what is more this ordinance aided the orderly development of territories from then on in our history.

In broader scope planning had its place in the early economic growth of the New Republic. "The Report on Manufacture" by Alexander Hamilton, combined provisions for the "quick-sighted guidance of the public interest" with the "incitement and patronage of government." This combination of private initiative and public control is planning at its best in our time. Less known or remembered was the provision in the Report for the creation of a Board for "promoting arts, agriculture, manufacture and commerce."

This concept of planning is also defined in broad terms in the early development of public works. These first plans for "promoting the internal improvements of our country" are similar to our conception of planned public works today. In his first annual message to Congress, President John Quincy Adams wrote in part, "Roads and canals, by multiplying and facilitating the communications and intercourse between distant regions and multitudes of men, are among the most important means of improvement."

These examples may serve to establish what the historical record reveals, namely, that planning in general is in the American tradition and has continued during the entire growth of the Republic.

In more specific terms, planning in State Constitutions is one of the inherent powers which grows out of the very nature of written charters. Every constitution sets limits upon the powers of government; those not expressly delegated are preserved to the people. Rights which are guaranteed are equated with duties that are to be undertaken. For freedom unrestrained by responsibility becomes license; responsibility

unchecked by freedom becomes arbitrary power. Thus, for example, the Connecticut Constitution of 1818 reads:—"Every citizen may speak freely, write and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of liberty."

Planning is, then, one of implied powers and essential functions of State Government; yet one will search in vain for any express planning provision in early State Constitutions. The liberal interpretation of the Welfare Clause of the Federal Constitution contains what Hamilton once wrote is a provision "as comprehensive as any that could have been used, and that it embraced a vast 'variety of particulars'".

A detailed examination of more recent state charters discloses but few in which specific reference is made to planning as such. There are, to be sure, certain provisions dealing with the planned use of property which reflect a changing attitude. Provision for the use of Eminent Domain appears in a majority of the States—twenty dealing principally with corporation property and franchises, principally in the West and South, and six states—California, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin which provide the method of the Excess Condemnation. Four states now grant the fee simple for Right-of-Way, namely Illinois, Missouri, Oklahoma and South Dakota. Five of the States provide a method of compensation for such taking of property.

While the limits of this discussion prevent an enumeration of more precise planning details in each of the 48 State Constitutions, a selection from our more recent State Constitutions will indicate both a trend and a standard of practice. The two trends in American Constitutional Government important to recognize are these:

(1) The extension of the Federal Government to include those functions which are essentially national in character;

(2) The strengthening of State Government to deal more effectively with matters at the local level and thereby preserve a working federalism.

Constitutional revision of State Charters has grown in recent years as we have discovered the extent to which our State Constitutions have been a barrier to efficient and economical government. Within the past decade three State Constitutions have been thoroughly revised to bring them into correspondence with modern needs. In their order they are:—New York, Missouri and New Jersey.

(I) Of these Constitutions the New York Charter which was revised by a Constitutional Convention in 1938 reflects the changing conceptions of Governmental functions. It stands as one of our most forward-looking Constitutions among the 48 States.

Article XIV on Conservation provides broad powers for the control of Wild Life, Conservation and Reforestation.

Article XVII on Social Welfare lays down the principle that the support of the needy are public concerns and shall be provided by the State and by such of its subdivisions as the Legislature may determine.

Article XVIII on Housing marks an even wider extension of power to provide low rent housing for persons of low income as defined by law, or for the clearance, replanning, reconstruction and rehabilitation of substandard and unsanitary areas, or for both such purposes, and for recreational and other facilities incidental or appurtenant thereto.

This article outlines the powers of municipalities for slum clearance, the liability for certain loans, the acquisition of property and excess condemnation for carrying out these purposes.

Beyond these new conservation powers, those dealing with housing represent the widest extension of planning powers to be found in the New York Constitution. Here, in a word, planning is expressly recognized as a government function with constitutional authority.

(II) The Missouri Constitution, which was revised by a Constitutional Convention during the War and adopted by the people in 1945, similarly looks to the future. It incorporates under the Legislative powers, for example, the State Park Fund (Section 47) 1c for each $100 of assessed value to be used in a fund "for the acquisition, supervision, operation, maintenance, development, control, regulation, restoration of State parks and State park property." Provision is also made in Section 48 for the acquisition of property for Historical Memorials and Monuments.

The power of Eminent Domain is set forth in this revised Charter in broad and inclusive terms. Powers of the Highway Commission are likewise broadened on all State highways. "Within cities these arteries may be constructed without limitations concerning the distance between houses or buildings abutting such highway, or concerning the width or type of construction."

Under Conservation, Section 40, the Conservation Commission may acquire by purchase, gift, eminent domain or otherwise all property necessary, useful or convenient for its purposes and shall exercise the right of eminent domain as provided by law for the Highway Commission.

Article VI of the new Missouri Constitution dealing with county charters may vest legislative power pertaining to public health . . . and planning and zoning on the part of counties outside of incorporated cities. A later section of this Article concerning the reclamation of substandard areas, authorizes legislation and ordinances "providing for the clearance, replanning . . . of blighted, substandard, or unsanitary areas" . .

(III) The latest Constitutional revision to be completed by a Delegate Convention is New Jersey. Two provisions in this new document are significant as revealing this further trend. They deserve to be quoted in full.

Article IV, Sec. 6, Paragraph 3.

"Any agency or political subdivision of the State or any agency of a politica subdivision thereof, which may be empowered to take or otherwise acquir private property for any public highway, parkway, airport, place, improvemen

or use, may be authorized by law to take or otherwise acquire a fee simple absolute or any lesser interest, and may be authorized by law to take or otherwise acquire a fee simple absolute in, easements upon, or the benefit of restrictions upon, abutting property to preserve and protect the public highway, parkway, airport, place, improvement, or use; but such taking shall be with just compensation."

Article VIII, Taxation and Finance, Sec. III, Paragraph 1.

"1. The clearance, replanning, development or redevelopment of blighted areas shall be a public purpose and public use, for which private property may be taken or acquired. Municipal, public or private corporations may be authorized by law to undertake such clearance, replanning, development or redevelopment; and improvements made for these purposes and uses, or for any of them, may be exempted from taxation, in whole or in part, for a limited period of time during which the profits of and dividends payable by any private corporation enjoying such tax exemption shall be limited by law. The conditions of use, ownership, management and control of such improvements shall be regulated by law."

The model State Constitution lists specific provisions for slum clearance and, the rehabilitation of blighted areas which augment home-rule powers. At the state level there are provisions dealing with Public Welfare, Public Housing, Conservation, Sightliness, Order and Historic Association, which are functionally related to and a part of intelligent community planning.

These, then, are some of the trends, as well as the actual Constitutional provisions on planning. In the days ahead we are destined to expand these provisions in State Constitutions as we come to realize that planning is not only in the American tradition but that it means freedom. In a dynamic society new areas of social control are frequently essential to establish new freedoms. "Planning," wrote Dr. Wirth, "calls upon us to mobilize our capacity for moral organizational and legal control to harness the great technological forces that science has set free and put at our disposal."

Planning under the express and implied powers of our State Constitution will insure that men's liberties are not imperiled but rather in fact strengthened. It should provide the procedure by which men can join together in building the durable foundations of a free society.

Seashore Planning

J. SPENCER SMITH, President of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association; Chairman, Division of Navigation, Department of Conservation, State of New Jersey; Chairman of the Interstate Sanitation Commission of the States of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, Tenefly, N. J.

IF THERE is one place that planning is vital and where the development of lands should be under supervision and control, it is those areas bordering on tidal waters or on the shores of the Great Lakes or any large body of water. Possibly, the defects in the lack of planning are more noticeable in the areas bordering on our oceanfronts. The reason is obvious—ocean storms, winds and currents frequently cause severe

erosion to take place in coastal areas. Where land bordering on the oceanfront has been accessible there has been a tendency to build structures as close to the existing high water line as the owner could do. Sand dunes have been levelled, highways have been built paralleling the ocean and adjacent thereto. The results have been that when storms do take place causing erosion, the properties are destroyed, roadways are frequently washed out and then comes the demand for shore protection.

Much of the money that has to be appropriated today to prevent erosion due to ocean storms could have been avoided if, in the past, the developments on the shores could have been controlled and plans made to keep developments a reasonable distance back from the high water mark. We know in areas where Nature is still in the raw that erosion takes place and then either winds or other storms bring back the sand that has been eroded. This, however, cannot be the case where buildings and structures have been erected on the shorefront leaving no play for the forces of Nature to act and react.

Because of what is done in the way of coast protective measures in one area affects adjacent areas, prepared planning for the right kind of development on our oceanfront should either be by counties or by the State. While much harm was been done in the past because of lack of planning, there are still areas where proper planning could be set up so as to preserve the use of the waterfront for the enjoyment of the public.

Going back prior to the days when the automobile became popular, most of our beaches could only be reached by rail and there was little occupancy of the oceanfront distant from the rail terminals. Most of our shoreline was inaccessible, excepting the popular resorts like Asbury Park, Long Branch, Atlantic City, Cape May and other places that were reached by rail. In the past ten to twenty years we have seen a remarkable change—as the saying goes, "America is now on wheels." Millions of dollars have been spent creating highways, both to our oceanfronts as well as paralleling them. This, in essence, has made practically the many miles of oceanfront scattered up and down our coastline available for homes and buildings of various kinds. People have demonstrated that they want to have their homes as close to the oceanfront as possible. Few people know of the problems associated with coast protective measures. Generally speaking, the only time they see the ocean is in the summer time when it is usually calm, or at best, when the storms are not very great, and, aside from an occasional hurricane, little or no damage takes place to the waterfront. Because of the ignorance on the part of the people as to the need for leaving a reasonable amount of ground free from any encumbrances from the high water mark landward to a reasonable building line it is necessary to have zones set up which will control how these areas are to be built upon.

It is well known that a small amount of beachfront will provide enjoyment for large numbers of people. In saying this, I have in mind

that there is ample room along our coastlines to provide accommodations for those who can afford their own homes on the oceanfront, for hotels, for beach clubs, and for large areas devoted to the use of the public. In other words, all classes of society, as well as the desires of the people for enjoyment, can be accommodated if the lands fronting our oceans are zoned and development is properly planned.

If the waters on our seashores are to be enjoyed with safety to the public, officials should see to it that these waters are free from pollution. It is so easy, and generally less costly, to pump sewage into the ocean than it is to provide for proper treatment plants. Communities wishing to attract people frequently feature their low tax rate, without explaining why. On the other hand the saving of money in taxes may be the cause of much illness which, in turn, can be very expensive, both from the loss of time, as well as the out-of-pocket cost for the restoration of health.

In planning shore developments one should try to harmonize whatever structures are erected to guard against erosion, to see that they possess the strength which will enable them to resist the power of ocean waves. Then, too, there is no rule of thumb that one can set up regarding the character and kind of structures that should be erected, the shore line, the currents, the winds, the nature of the storms, all must be taken into consideration when designing structures to prevent erosion and at the same time to protect and build up beaches. A cardinal principle to follow, and a safe one, is, so far as possible, to try to harmonize whatever is done in the way of shore protective measures, with Nature, itself. Never try to fight Nature on a shore line if it can be avoided.

Fortunately, through the efforts of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, Congress has entrusted the supervision and protection of our shoreline, as well as the shores of the Great Lakes, into the hands of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Within the Corps is a Board known as the United States Beach Erosion Board. This Board is constantly studying shore protective measures with the end in view that they can be of help to communities who are desirous of protecting and preserving their shorefronts. It would be very helpful to the Corps, and would also assist the communities, themselves, if the several States were to establish agencies which would be authorized to study and participate in the construction of structures that would protect and preserve their beaches.

If you will read into the thoughts that I have tried to give expression to here you will see emphasized the need for *Seashore Planning.*

Discussion

H. KENNON FRANCIS, Principal Planning Technician, Alabama State Planning Board; *Leader*
RONALD SCOTT, Senior Planning Technician, Tennessee State Planning Commission; *Reporter*

FOLLOWING the two papers by Russell VanNest Black and Spencer Miller, Jr. dealing with Land Planning in New Jersey and State Constitutional Provisions for Planning, the discussion leader asked for questions from the floor.

Mrs. J. Walter Goldstein, from St. Louis, Missouri, commented upon the new Missouri State Constitution. She indicated that they were pleased with their fine constitution in practically all respects; but one important phase of community activity had been inadvertently omitted from its provisions. Through an oversight public housing in St. Louis is prohibited. Mrs. Goldstein wished to warn other States contemplating constitutional revisions to be very careful about checking all phases and implications of a new state constitution before recommending it.

Prof. H. O. Whittemore from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, asked Mr. Miller if the new constitution for the State of New Jersey permitted the use of excess condemnation in acquiring land for public purposes. Mr. Miller replied in the affirmative, although he indicated that excess condemnation was not provided for in so many words.

J. P. Conner, Contra Costa, California, described a long automobile trip through the various southern States to Florida and then north to Newark and he placed particular emphasis upon the very striking situation which he met in nearly every community of any size through which his travels took him. It was convenient and pleasant to travel from city to city on fine state and Federal highways but it was anything but convenient or pleasant to travel in or pass through the urban communities. Narrow crooked streets created many delays and traffic hazards which were a marked contrast to the conditions which existed on the open highways. Mr. Conner observed that much needed to be done in order to relieve this difficult situation.

On this same subject *General Grant* questioned Spencer Miller, on the application of Federal Aid to this problem of highways. Although Mr. Miller's paper concerned constitutional revisions he is also the State Highway Commissioner for New Jersey, and his reply was made as a State Highway Commissioner. He indicated that the 1942–43 Federal Aid program was thinly conceived and for that reason it did not meet the whole problem as well as it might have. The assistance given by this program benefited rural roads only and consequently was devoted only to one phase of the highway problem. A new concept of Federal Aid has gradually arisen which may be aptly expressed as aiming to "get the farmer out of the mud and the motorist out of the muddle." Interested organizations succeeded in amending the Federal Aid program

in 1944 to permit the expenditure of 25 percent of the Federal Aid funds on urban highway development. With this change in emphasis the cities may look to their State Highway Departments for substantial aid. Earlier Federal Aid tended to amplify the need for assistance to urban highway developments since it brought fine highways and large volumes of traffic to the boarders of urban communities but provided no way for the traffic to move beyond that point. The Federal Aid programs of the future will greatly encourage better planning of highway systems and better integration of plans and funds.

With reference to the state planning activities *General Grant* asked Mr. Black to describe how integration of state plans and local plans is achieved. In reply Mr. Black pointed out that in New Jersey preliminary state plans are developed and submitted to public hearings. When the changes that are made necessary by these public hearings are incorporated in the State Plan, it will be given wider distribution to all local groups interested and it is expected that these groups will give the plans further study. The process is a continuous one in which recommendations from local groups to the State Planning Commission will be expected from time to time. This process must go on for a period of years during which time the many recommendations of local groups will be incorporated into an ever increasing body of information which, when properly integrated, will constitute the State Master Plan.

At the conclusion of the paper by J. Spencer Smith the discussion leader called for further comments from the floor. In response to a question from *General Grant* Mr. Smith described some of the activities that are taking place in New Jersey and he went on to point out that some sort of public ownership of shoreline property is reasonable and necessary if proper shore protection is to be obtained. Public ownership of shoreline properties may seem most unreasonable at first glance but it is about the only way that proper control of erosion can be achieved through the construction of necessary protective works. Due to numerous examples of loss of private property by shoreline owners it is not too hard to convince the people that public ownership is necessary. To this end the Government engineers in charge of shoreline protection are particularly anxious to find effective legal controls for shoreline developments. Shoreline plans and methods of regulating shoreline development have not been devised to any great extent anywhere in the country, although such control is badly needed. This is a field in which much original thinking needs to be done and Planning Commissions are eminently suited to this undertaking. In New Jersey plans have been developed for ten seashore parks intended for public recreational purposes and beach erosion controls. Efforts have been made to obtain funds for these parks but it has been hard to sell the State Legislature on the idea because the people who use the parks frequently come from a great distance and feel nothing more than a passing interest in any given park development.

Round Table on Service of State Planning Boards to Local Planning

PANEL: Elisabeth M. Herlihy, Chairman, Mass. State Planning Board, *Chairman;* Russell Van Nest Black, Planning Consultant, New Hope, Pa.; H. K. Francis, Alabama State Planning Bd.; P. E. Middleton, Indiana Economic Council; Ronald F. Scott, Tenn. State Planning Commission; Alvah J. Webster, Rhode Island State Planning Bd.; M. W. Torkelson, Wisconsin State Planning Bd.
Frank A. Batstone, Connecticut State Development Commission, *Reporter.*

Russell Van Nest Black, Planning Consultant, New Hope, Pa.—"What type of service, technical or otherwise, should a State Planning Board render to local planning agencies in order to give the maximum of assistance in keeping with the highest standards of professional practice?"

A great portion of a State's planning board activity should consist of promotion and assistance of planning and zoning to the local units of Government. The following is in the realm of recommended state activity:

1. To create a climate favorable to local planning, (a) by promotion and the establishment of adequate state enabling legislation, (b) by general education of government bodies and the general public, (c) by the construction of foundation and framework upon which local units can develop their plans.
2. To create an overall *state plan*, the framework of which is of value to the local municipality. The local development can come along within the framework of *state plan.*

In the guidance of overall organizational and procedural activities, the direct application might be as follows: (a) education of planning boards in regard to their powers, duties, procedures and objectives; (usually planning boards are appointed out of thin air and the state planning board could help to direct their activities along proper lines); (b) routine advisory on organization, appropriations and legal approval; (advisory work could be accomplished in various ways by publishing planning manuals, state legislation, etc.—procedures and practices handbook as to how to conduct planning work)—(c) the publication of bulletins with current information regarding conferences, speeches, etc.; (d) act as a trouble-shooting service to iron out current knotty problems which come up.

State planning boards are in a position to coordinate local planning efforts.

State *technical aid* should not be carried on into the local planning units. The state should fulfill its primary function, the first of which is a state development plan. State planning boards should limit themselves to the general purposes as outlined in the foregoing. The speaker does not believe in the extension of the state influence into local plans.

H. K. Francis, Principal Planning Technician, State Planning Board, Montgomery, Alabama. "A state agency's local assistance program in municipal master planning."

Mr. Francis stated that he is in favor with most of the comments which Mr. Black had made. However, with the exception of the last statement regarding the state's extension of planning service to local communities, there seems to be a trend in variance of state service from that of none to that of almost complete planning service such as is the practice in Tennessee and Alabama.

The Alabama program developed because of definite needs and local peculiarities: (a) no private consultants were available in the State until very recently, (b) services would have had to come at a high cost from consultants in other parts of the country, (c) the towns are not financially able to obtain the proper technical assistance (even a simple zoning ordinance is relatively costly and out of their reach financially).

The system is this: The town pays half and the State pays half of the expenses involved in providing technical assistance to local planning units. The State employs the technical help. This keeps costs down and minimizes wasted effort and time on extraneous material. The work is carried on directly with local commissions and not with unofficial bodies such as chambers of commerce. Contracts are always made between the local planning commission and the State.

Two major fields of activity occupy the state planning board's interests: (1) industrial development, and (2) town planning. The latter involves zoning, subdivision control, park and playground development, etc. The state planning board aids in the planning of such community activities in the absence of the planning consultant.

Town planning is not centralized in the State through state participation any more than a private consultant's might be centralized. In fact decentralized working arrangements have been developed which inject local feeling and local participation in town planning work.

One great advantage in town planning activity in Alabama is that it is set up to be of a continuing nature. The State is in a position to *follow through* in its aid to the local planning units and the State acts as a real trouble-shooter in this regard.

As to the state master plan in Alabama, two elements of the plan have been developed to date and are in force. Before funds for state projects can be let out, they must be reviewed in light of these master plan elements. In this manner there is a control of state development in accordance to the state master plan.

P. E. Middleton, Assistant Director, Indiana Economic Council, Indianapolis, Ind. "The function of a state agency in making the results of local planning realistic in terms of long range programming of municipal expenditures."

Mr. Middleton states that a state agency should function in the same category as all other types of state aid in making local planning realistic. The opinions of various state planning boards vary greatly as there is a wide variation in enabling legislation of the States. There may be a wide

variety of assistance which States may render, such as education, talks, advice, and even to *doing* the job.

The general policy in Indiana is that the State is interested in the local plan realization inasmuch as the State as a whole improves thereby. The assistance to local units involves a minimum of advice in the program and setup of their local planning units. The state steps out and they (the local units) seek private consultancy service if they so desire. The interest of the state planning board in relation to local planning should ordinarily confine itself to *education* as to the value of planning, its *administration* and the *manner* and procedures by which it is to be carried out. This is done by manuals, demonstration projects, etc.

Ordinarily the state planning board should keep its nose out of local planning business, especially as to the programming of local improvement projects. The job should be done locally, the State merely acting in an advisory capacity and again as a liaison and trouble-shooter.

Ronald F. Scott, Director, Upper East Tennessee Office, State Planning Commission, Johnson City, Tenn. "Coordinating influences of state assistance upon state, regional and local problems."

Mr. Scott stated that the Tennessee process is similar to that as stated by Mr. Francis of Alabama. However, to carry the point a bit further, Mr. Scott stressed the advantage of the type of service which Tennessee and Alabama renders (which includes technical assistance) as being the *continuing follow-through* value which is gained by the method. He stated that all the detailed assistance which is rendered to the local planning units is not always the type and calibre which might be provided by a consultant. Perhaps the state program of local assistance should be more thorough than the State can provide at present. Such deficiencies, however, are greatly offset by the value of the *continuous* aid which the State is able to render.

The value of the type of service rendered by the Tennessee state planning board lies also in the coordinating possibilities of local planning. The State participates in the meetings of local groups. They contact local officials and the state staff is put in a position whereby it can familiarize itself with local programs and local groups. The State is in a position to coordinate action on problems of mutual interest to local planning groups; *i.e.*, the city-county mutual problems, and the city-city mutual problems. Ordinarily common interest planning activity between such local planning units would never receive the assimilated approach which the State can expedite. Local level coordination is provided in the subjects of highways, airports of joint operation, TVA reservoirs and planning problems generated by such installations.

The state program is brought to the local people and the wishes of the local people are brought back to the State. This is accomplished through proper legislation, by contacting all planning commissions almost monthly, and by coordinating state programs with the local leve

efforts in the matter of highways, statewide hospital plans, health, welfare, etc. These state programs are brought to the local level in growing numbers and in complexity. The state planning board makes known to the local planning units the many services which the various state departments might render to them.

Alvah J. Webster, Director of State Planning, State Planning Board, Providence, R. I. "The interpretation and application of basic statewide data to local planning practices and procedures."

Mr. Webster stated that the Rhode Island approach was quite a bit different from that of Tennessee and Alabama as expressed by Messrs. Scott and Francis. The general policy is based more upon Mr. Black's statement; however, the emphasis varies.

The service to local boards is limited to the working tools which Mr. Black spoke of earlier. Publications of the various phases of local planning are issued. The implementation is primarily by *personal* contact. The varied requirements of differently located towns limits the use of such tools as standard manuals, etc.

The procedure is pretty much as follows in R. I.: First, the interest must be shown by the local communities; the state planning board makes contact after interest has been demonstrated; advice or material is provided as the need may be. The advice or material comes from the state planning board itself or other state departments, depending on the nature of the requests. Having provided the local planning units with the proper tools, the state planning board merely "sits in" to *interpret* these tools.

Mr. Webster emphasized the importance in "giving time" to local units as to *how to use* the material with which they are provided. He was very insistent on the idea that the planning manuals *must be followed up* by personal contacts for their proper interpretation. The amount of this type of service that may be rendered by the state planning staff is practically unlimited.

Many local planning units request financial assistance. Very often they want money, staff help, etc. It is Mr. Webster's opinion that it is not the place of the state agency to participate in this manner. He emphasized the fact that a community development plan is the cheapest thing in which a town might invest. It provides them with the basis for their physical public improvements, depending on a sound economical planning program. In the long run, the plan is a small part of the total cost of such a program of community development. He stated that there is no community in Rhode Island, to his knowledge, that could not afford plans for reasonable community development projects. If the community is sincere, it can find money to do the local plans. In many instances they can carry on a considerable portion of the actual planning work themselves, consisting of small surveys and the assembling of data or information already in their own local records.

It was further pointed out that it is unfeasible for local planning units to gather statistical material which relates only to itself and its confines. It is important that they analyze local statistics, but local units should go beyond their own confines to get its relative position to those of its neighbors. Mr. Webster stated that communities are interested primarily in their own units and lack any appreciation of coordinating their planning efforts in relation to contiguous communities or to the State as a whole. A community does not exist by itself and should recognize this fact. Local plans of local planning agencies should be geared to the development taking place in the groups of communities within a given area or within the State itself. The State strives for coordination and integration by the combination of well-integrated local plans of development. To really get the planning done, the greatest extent of it must be done locally, the State merely acting as a catalyst, working together with the municipalities.

M. W. Torkelson, Director, Regional Planning, State Planning Board, Madison, Wis. "Due to causes that are inherent in American municipal government, is the field of professional planner in private practice diminishing?"

Due to many inherent factors, planning is becoming more and more a public function whether it is by state or municipal agencies. In either case, Mr. Torkelson goes along with Mr. Black in the separation of state planning functions from those of municipal planning.

In regard to state planning, however, he stated that he had lived in Wisconsin some 40 years and had been in planning for 20 years and feels that he, as yet, doesn't know enough on the subject to make a so-called *State Plan;* nor does he believe anyone else in Wisconsin is qualified.

Even if the state planning board were in a position to prepare plans on the local level you would have opposition from the legislators and be asked to keep "hands off."

Mr. Torkelson cited an instance where some Washington, D. C. officials requested that a regional plan be developed which would encompass an area from West Virginia to Wisconsin. Although he thought the task impossible, one was worked up rather rapidly to please the Washington request. However, no one in Washington knew what they *wanted* either before or after the *plans* were made. As might be expected nothing of significance has come as a result of this regional *plan.*

In another example, he stated that Madison, Wis., had had three professional plans. Two have been received and paid for. The first is in the archives gathering dust; it was a grandiose plan to begin with, and probably the only thing realized from it were some of the parks which were recommended. The second plan has not been heard of since its completion. The third will probably go the way of the others. The professional planner goes in, does the work, completes it, delivers it, gets paid and then leaves. Often that is where the *planning* ends. Further

negotiations are often necessary for the successful continuance of plans prescribed by the professional planner.

In the larger cities, Mr. Torkelson stated the doors were often shut after the horse had gone. It's the State's interest in smaller communities to prevent the repetition of mistakes which have occurred in the larger cities. He doubted the benefit of big city planning in the smaller communities.

In small communities planning must be a local product if it is going to be put into effect. In Wisconsin, a technique has been worked out by which the home folks do much of the work, primarily because the state planning staffs are limited and it must be done locally if done at all; secondly, because the home folks know what they want, understand their needs and are the ones to carry out the recommended plans. The plans must be *lived with* after they are made and in this instance the local participation is important.

The state participation varies in different communities. In a town of 376, the State did most of the work. If, in a larger community, there is a town or city engineer, he often does the planning work under state guidance. In a community of 2,000 the State gave a minimum of assistance, following through with the usual routine—maps were supplied with instructions for the development of basic planning data, etc. A two-year period elapsed—when back came the maps to the state planning office. On these maps were drafted excellent foundation planning material. On the basis of the material so submitted the state planner was able to draft an ordinance and map for the community. The local citizens departed with the draft and again were not heard from for a long period of time. Again a call came for an appointment and the local citizen planners came to the state capitol for a conference. Detailed points were worked out and the local group went happily home with the final solutions. The larger cities in Wisconsin are equipping themselves with technical planning staffs.

Miss Herlihy cited an instance as an example of state planning aid in Massachusetts. A local planning board was involved in a housing problem and was discouraged with the aspects of the future growth of the community with relation to the housing problem at hand. It was felt that perhaps a venture into a large scale housing project might leave them, at some future date, with a huge liability on their hands. The local board was obviously worried for the future and their local chances in regard to the employment of new residents of the community.

The state planning staff went into a bit of research to investigate the local communities' relative position as to employment and residency for the future by comparing local, state and national figures as to industry and housing and local trends. In relation to these local, state and national figures it indicated that the community was in a very hopeful position. The industrial picture was good and there was a definite hous-

ing need. A letter of these findings was sent by the state planning board to the local commission.

The local board would have had to compile this information by great effort, whereas the state planning board could gather it with relative ease. The state board gathered the information from various state and national departments. The local planning board expressed gratitude for the information which the State furnished and was going ahead on its planning program on the basis of the letter.

In Massachusetts the state planning board never goes into a community without an invitation from the local planning unit. The state planning board responds by sending material such as planning publications, forms and legislative information. Very often the local units ask—"Where can we get a planning consultant?" The state planning board answers such a request with a list of planning consultants arranged in alphabetical order.

In regard to the regional grouping of communities for regional planning action, she stated that there is an inherent suspicion among the local boards. For this reason there is not much regional activity and a total lack of budgeting or a combining together of budgets for planning purposes. There is a definite tendency for local zoning boards to copy other existing ordinances for their own use. This generally is not a good practice, as tailor-made plans and zoning plans are necessary to fit the differences which are found in communities. The state planning board reviews and points out any obvious errors in new zoning ordinances which might be submitted for their review.

Miss Herlihy cited an example of the state planning board's coordination of the efforts of several state departments in the development of the master plan of highways for the Metropolitan area of Boston. Long-range plans in Massachusetts in general are developed by the individual state departments. It is the job of the planning board to coordinate the various elements of the state master plan as developed by the various state departments.

In closing, the question as to the definition of what a *State Plan*, is, was raised. Is it something developed by the State which envisions everything in relation to public developments? Or should it be a coordination of the activities of the various state agencies with the state planning board putting itself in a position to help in the dovetailing of these state plans? It is generally agreed that a way must be found by which more and more local planning assistance may be provided by a limited state staff. This may be accomplished through regional meetings with the state personnel being present to aid in the discussions, through education, through the personal follow-up of printed material sent out from state agencies, through meetings of state federations of planning and zoning agencies, such as have been formed in the States of Connecticut and New York.

1285966

STATE PARKS

The Nature of State Parks and Parkways

DR. LAURIE D. COX, President, New England College, Henniker, N. H.

IT IS obvious that with a subject as comprehensive as the one given me, one can discuss only a minute part in a short talk. I will, therefore, confine myself to certain phases in which I have definite interests and which have not I believe been overdone in park discussions.

It has always seemed to me unfortunate (from the standpoint of park service to the public) that our development of parks has, because of government expediency, been forced to proceed upon a nation-wide classification based on political ownership rather than upon a nation-wide classification based upon the nature or function of park areas, and the public's recreational needs to be supplied by such areas.

The unscientific character of a political ownership classification is evident if we take as a comparison the supplying of educational service which is perhaps nearer to recreational service than any other. What would we think of a conception of public education that classified our schools into city-schools, county schools, state schools and national schools with no attention being given as to what proportion were primary schools, how many secondary schools, or if there were any technical schools or colleges at all. Instead, we find our educational system, whether supplied by villages, cities, counties, States or private organizations, or various combinations of these, classified and organized only as regards their function and purpose. We are now at the point where the national government is entering the educational picture with financial support and yet, there is no question of setting up new classes of schools under national oversight. Instead, the national government is to supply additional funds for the types of schools now in existence.

Several years ago the National Conference on State Parks, after study covering more than a year, produced a plan for Federal aid to state parks. This resulted in a definite bill embodying this idea being introduced into Congress. However, a bill for similar Federal aid to education which was introduced into Congress much later, has become law, while the park legislation has not yet even received good publicity. May it not be that the vague and conflicting ideas as to what state parks are for and what is their park service function and where they fit into the recreational picture with national parks on the one hand and county and city parks on the other, have accounted for a lack of national interest in support for the state park objective?

There is no scientific reason for a classification of parks on the basis of political ownership. A large wild, naturalistic scenic area, to function properly as a public park, should be the same thing in its essential

character and type of service whether owned and administered by a city, a county, a metropolitan district, a State, a group of States or even by the national government. An occasional park planner or landscape architect may realize this; but the public at large, does not. The confusion found in the aims of much park development, and especially in state park development, and the premises upon which these aims rest, are probably more the result of uncertain thinking regarding park classifications than any other single thing.

The development or creation of those recreational areas for public use, which we call parks today, is by no means a new idea, in spite of frequent statements appearing from time to time in our park literature to that effect. If we consider the two most distinct and basic forms of park and recreation area, we find their origins and their prototypes in remote antiquity. The ACADEMIA and the LYCEUM of Ancient Athens were as definite examples of public parks devoted to active recreation, such as athletic games, as any modern play field. It was in these areas and others like them in other Greek cities that the Greek philosophers first sought their disciples and laid the foundations of a higher education which has culminated in the colleges and universities of the past few hundred years. (It should be interesting to modern educators to note that learning, not athletics was the extra-curricular activity of these the earliest known form of university.) It has always seemed to me that park people were caught napping when they permitted the collegiate world to appropriate the word "*academic*" which really should be the English word of classic origin to designate the park and recreation idea rather than education.

We likewise find examples of the other great basic form of park in antiquity. Wild or naturalistic scenic area had its prototype in the two forms of naturalistic park which existed among the ancient Babylonians.

Of the many park problems that warrant the interest and study of park planners, and especially state park planners, there is probably none more important to the future development of parks in this country than the provision of a single comprehensive classification of park areas as to purpose and function. Such a classification should pertain to all the park holdings of the Nation, whether they are under the political supervision of village, town, county, urban region, State or Nation. Such a classification is wholly feasible and could be developed from the existing classifications in use, for the more standardized forms of municipal and metropolitan parks and the proposed classifications for state parks and certain types of national park areas. There is only needed direction in the form of able leadership, either by an individual or an organization.

Although the United States, as we see on the basis of history, is a comparative newcomer in the park world, our accomplishments in both the number of our public parks and the quantity of their development,

surpasses that of other lands of modern times. Certain individual cities such as Paris and London may outrank our individual cities in the quality of their better park areas. But in the average of our park accomplishments as a Nation we are unequalled. We have particularly made progress in understanding the value and necessity of park or recreation service.

The scientific idea of a group of inter-related parks forming a park system is also peculiarly an American idea. Its origin was with two of our American park pioneers, the elder Olmsted and Charles Elliot. The acceptance of the phrase "park system" has become so general since their time that each one of our political park divisions is normally referred to as possessing a park system. Thus we hear of city park systems, metropolitan park systems, county park systems, state park systems, and sometimes even of a national park system. Upon examination we find, however, that the phrase *park system*, save in the case of a few municipal or metropolitan park organizations, is generally a misnomer. Apparently the public has come to use the term park system as a synonym for a collection of parks under some single administrative unit. Park people themselves often so seem to understand the form.

The term *park system*, if accurately used, can refer only to a group of park areas, systematized in some way. This systematization could be with respect to number, size, strategic location, and relation to each other and to their definite and specialized functions, which by complementing and supplementing each other, would solve all or the greater part of the recreational needs of the public which is to be served by the park system. A water reservoir or a dozen reservoirs without distribution mains would not be a water system. A collection of several forms of secondary schools without grammar schools, primary schools or colleges would not constitute an educational system. Likewise a general collection of parks, no matter how large the collection, does not constitute a park system.

The idea or conception of a park system as visualized by its originators was a combined and coordinated group of *municipal* and *metropolitan* park areas. This original conception recognized several distinct classes of park areas as regards function, with the accompanying conditions of strategic distribution based on population, and the unit size of areas adjusted to their purpose together with a coordinating of the major areas by attenuated park strips carrying roadways, walks or bridle paths for which the name *parkway* was coined. This original idea of a systematized and adequately functioning group of park areas to provide the necessary recreational service for a large urban region was so well worked out and based so clearly upon the service to be provided by the different forms of area that today, more than sixty years later, the idea has been little changed. If one were to ask any well trained landscape architect or park planner in any section of the United States to list the major

classes of parks for a comprehensive municipal or metropolitan park system, one would get almost exactly the same classification from each. For none of our other types of park development, based on political ownership is there any similar definitely recognized classification, depending upon park function. This is particularly true of state parks.

I have examined many official reports of state park organizations. I have visited most of the State, operating well organized park areas and have had the opportunity of visiting dozens of state parks of various character in the company of their operating personnel. In a number of States former park administrative students of mine are serving, and they keep me informed of their park developments. In the State of New York I have been active in the design and administration of parks in one of the several state park regions for more than twenty years. Thus I have a fairly good general picture of that form of parks which comprise the state and regional field.

It is not only a fair statement but an accurate one to say that we have no such thing at present as any State with a state park system. New York State has one of the largest state park acreages and some of the most elaborate and highly developed individual state park areas. New York also has one of the greatest mileages of existing and proposed state parkways. Yet New York State does not have what could truthfully be called a state park system or even a master plan for such a projected system. The lack of a well understood classification for state parks is chiefly to blame for this lack.

The writer was for some years a member of a standing committee on state parks for the American Society of Landscape Architects. This committee was composed of landscape architects, well experienced in the state park field. The major activity of this committee for several years was an attempt to produce a satisfactory classification of state park areas which might represent a coordinated state park system. This committee nearly, but not quite, reached agreement on such a classification. One member, later produced the only comprehensive master plan for a state park system yet published and which embodied a very good classification. The writer of this paper also has published a somewhat similar suggested classification which is found in a bulletin on state parks and which probably most of you know. This classification has been well received by many state park operators. We thus have what approaches very close to classifications for state parks capable of general acceptance. Both of these tentative classifications represent, I believe, a tendency on the part of forward-looking state park planners to realize that before we can ever have well coordinated state park systems, we must have a clear understanding of what kinds of state parks are possible, what are their relative values and functions as compared with either local or national parks, what are efficient sizes for the various types to realize their major functions and why, when and where state parks

should be located. You cannot build an efficient building until you know whether it is to be a house, a barn, a church, a factory or a gas station. Whether or not such a building will be a successful building will depend, not on anyone's personal whim nor on what kind of building some builder likes to build, but solely on what kind of a building is needed for a definite purpose in a definite location. Further, the building must be built for its own purpose, not for half a dozen other and possibly conflicting purposes. The same things are all true if a park of any form is to be successful and a state park is no exception.

Aside from the classification problem, another of the very major problems in state park development, and this is also true of the other groups of parks as to political ownership, is *how much* park service does the public need and *how much* can the public afford? Park service is, of course, not a luxury but a necessity, but even for necessities there is an economic limit. In no phase of peace time public service has the United States been more sympathetic and more generous than in its financial provision for education. Yet the educational experts do not rest their financial claims upon sentiment, generalities and high ideals. They can tell you exactly how much school space we need for the different classes of schools, how much is the cost per pupil for public education in any State and also what experience seems to indicate both as a minimum and a maximum cost for adequate educational service. We have nothing even approaching such figures for park service.

The elder Olmsted proposed many years ago a figure applying to large urban regions of one acre of park land for each 100 of the population. This figure was not the result of any research in sociology or economics, but was a figure based on an examination of existing conditions and which, by the trial and error method, seemed to indicate a ratio which permitted in the case of large urban regions, enough acreage to provide both a reasonable number and a reasonable distribution of park areas and individual parks of adequate size. This figure has been used ever since and is often referred to by park planners as if it had both legal sanction and divine approval. It is unquestionably a sound figure, especially for cities or urban regions of good size. It is not too satisfactory a figure for cities with less than 100,000 population. It was intended to cover all forms of park holdings for an urban region whether the parks were of municipal, county or metropolitan ownership. It was, also, a figure not beyond the economic means of the cities of Olmsted's day.

Some research which I have carried on over a number of years on city park maintenance costs, indicates that where cities have equaled such a ratio or had a more generous ratio than this one to one hundred, their maintenance costs per acre and per capital have tended to decline and the conditions of their park areas to improve. On the other hand, where cities fell much below this ratio, their maintenance costs, both per acre and per capita, have tended to increase and the conditions of

their parks to deteriorate. This acreage ratio for city parks thus seems to stand analysis quite well.

We have never had any such satisfactory figures on park *costs* on the basis of population. I have examined cost figures for approximately 150 cities over a number of years. These figures based on the pre-war value of the dollar, showed that cities of one million and over had per capita costs ranging from 84c to $3 with a reasonable average around $1.75. Cities of one-quarter to one-half a million showed per capita costs ranging from 14c to $2 with a reasonable average around $1.25. Cities from fifty thousand to a quarter of a million had per capita costs of ranging from 25c to $2.50, with a reasonable average around $1. Thus, it would appear that city park service at reasonably good standards could be provided on prewar dollar values at a figure between $1.50 and $2 per capita. This would possibly represent an expenditure under the present conditions of inflation of $3 to $4 per capita. Any figure to be determined for state and national park expenditures on a per capita ratio must of course be on the basis of a supplemental figure. It would certainly be desirable to know what might be considered a fair cost for all forms of park service per capita for the Nation.

Educational costs below the college level are considered fairly satisfactory at around $50 per pupil which would probably mean somewhere around $10 or $15 per capita. When one realizes that park or recreational service may be more important to the biological future of the race than even education, it would appear that we have room for a condiderable addition to the suggested municipal figure for our state and national share of park cost. The motor age in which we now live probably indicates that the state and national parks have at least as vital a place in the park service picture of today as urban park service had in a past generation. That might, therefore, indicate a combined figure for all park service of $4 per capita under normal times or $6 to $8 today.

For state or national parks we have never produced any ratio as to necessary park acreage and any determination of state and national park costs is of course, dependent upon such a ratio. Some years ago a report was produced for a proposed state park development in one of our larger, richer and more populous States and the ratio suggested was the same one acre per hundred of population. This being the first state figure I had seen in print, I wrote the author of the report, a planner of repute, to see on what he based this figure and I found that he was only repeating the old Olmsted ratio for city and metropolitan parks.

While I realize that few, if any, forms of modern public service are so lacking in research as that pertaining to parks, it would seem that some park authority should have the experience and the temerity to set up a figure on a state, national or combined basis for us to shoot at.

In default of any accepted figures for an acreage ratio or per capita cost for state parks, we can examine certain typical States which repre-

sent varying degrees of state park service and from such an examination perhaps determine the tendency of such figures. I have selected the State of New York, Indiana and Connecticut for such examination. These are all States with long established state park organizations and represent high, medium and low cost development. New York probably stands near the top in state park accomplishment since it has one of the largest areas of state park holdings and some of the most elaborately developed state parks. The park service problem in New York State with respect to population, is of course, somewhat confused by the fact that the State, in addition to its normal state parks, owns something over two million acres of forest lands in the Catskills and the Adirondacks, which exist by Constitutional provision solely for recreational purposes, yet are in no sense parks and only provide limited recreational possibilities, because recreational development is also forbidden by Constitutional provision. The latest figures obtainable for New York State (1946) show a total area in state parks and parkways of 175,218 acres, with something over fifty individual park areas, the largest of which is 65,000 acres. New York has an existing mileage in Parkways of 144 miles and 197 miles definitely projected. The annual budget for the last fiscal year (1947–48) was $8,422,908. Since the population of New York is approximately thirteen and one-half million, the state park acreage ratio is approximately one acre of park area to 76 persons of the population, and the annual per capita cost for state parks in the State approximately 62 cents.

The State of Indiana like New York has been one of the pioneers in state park development, and its state park accomplishments are nationally famous. Indiana on 1947 figures has an acreage of approximately 41,000 acres, distributed among fifteen major state parks. The state parks of Indiana provide almost the entire scenic recreation service for the State since the State has no important forest areas well provided with recreational facilities. Indiana also does not contain extensive scenic regions providing commercial facilities for public recreation, such as exist so extensively in New York. The population of Indiana is slightly under three and one-half million, so that the ratio of state park acreage is approximately one acre to 86 of the population, quite close to the New York State figure. The annual state park expenditure for last year in Indiana was in round numbers, $660,000, giving a state park cost per capita of approximately 19 cents.

The State of Connecticut was, I believe, the first State seriously to attempt state wide park development and has a long established and well distributed group of parks which are exceedingly well diversified as to scenic character. The individual Connecticut state parks are mostly of modest size but they are supplemented by extensive state forests administered by the same general organization. These forests are of much larger acreage and many of them provide considerable facilities for recreation. Connecticut has approximately 12,500 acres in state parks

distributed among some 50 parks, the maximum size for an individual park being approximately 1,000 acres. Connecticut represents state park service provided with extreme economy. Although the number and distribution of the parks is excellent and although practically all parks are developed to handle the full recreational load which the size and character of the park warrants, the State has until very recently featured extremely simple forms of development and construction which probably give Connecticut first place among our state park organizations for economy in cost in proportion to the amount and quality of parks service rendered. Connecticut like New York also has extensive state wide commercial facilities for scenic recreation. The annual state park costs for Connecticut for the last year for which I have figures was $209,125. The population of the State is approximately 1,500,000. The acreage ratio for Connecticut is thus one acre to 136 of the population, not far from one half that of either New York or Indiana. The cost ratio per capita is approximately 13 cents.

If we were to set up an average theoretical state park acreage ratio as an average of these three States, which well typify high, low and a average cost for park service we would have a figure of almost exactly one acre of state park land to 100 of the population (99.3 to be exact). It would be interesting to know whether the old Olmsted ratio influenced the park planners, consciously or unconsciously in these three States, or whether the figure has a mystical quality of which we are ignorant. In either case, it would seem as if a satisfactory park ratio of all park holdings in a State whose population is reasonably distributed between urban and rural regions would be two acres of park lands of all classes, (exclusive of national parks) per 100 of the population to be about equally distributed between state, metropolitan and local parks.

If we could determine sound cost and acreage ratios and if we could coordinate a state park classification with our accepted urban region classification, we thus might set up a scientific evaluation of the whole public park problem below the national level which would place park or recreational service to the public on a similarly sound basis with that which today marks educational service to the public through its various levels.

I have not in this discussion mentioned particularly state parkways. Some States with good state park development have little or no mileage in parkways and others are particularly parkway-minded. The parkway problem whether considered on a state, national or regional basis is, of course, a question in itself. I incline to the original idea which produced the parkway. That is that a parkway—a true parkway is a form of park area which must be judged as to its value and function by its park character alone. It is true that the character of the parkway is fast changing and may perhaps have already changed, so far as to be no longer a park feature. I have visited many of the existing parkways.

I would rate the two most successful parkways I have seen, one a National Parkway and one a municipal parkway. Likewise I would rate the two least successful parkways (as parkways) which I have seen, also one a National Parkway and one a municipal parkway.

Certainly the time is not far away when both the public and the park planners must decide whether a parkway, whatever its political ownership, derives its value and reason for existence as a park feature with a traffic function, or as a traffic feature with some secondary park value, much as a cemetery or a reservoir site may have secondary park ratios. If the latter viewpoint is to prevail as much recent development rather tends to indicate, then the area and cost of parkways should not be permitted to confuse any attempt to determine the amount and cost of essential park service to the public.

State Parks and Related Recreational Areas

THERE are reported to be 3,346 areas with a total acreage of 7,743,454, administered by the 47 States in the Union. Colorado, alone, has no state parks. Of this acreage, 4,617,629 is classified as state parks; 19,778 acres in 310 historic sites or memorials; 18,155 acres in 25 parkways; 3,071,885 acres in 221 forests; 10,650 acres in four wildlife areas; and 5,357 acres in 1,570 waysides. In these state-owned reservations there are accommodations for 36,674 guests—3,338 in hotels and lodges; 21,062 in organized camps; 2,825 in sleeping cabins; 9,451 in housekeeping cabins, with tent spaces for 13,575 and trailer space for 11,350.

In *Alabama*, state parks and monuments total 27,743 acres; state forests 49,563 acres.

In *Arizona*, state parks and similar reservations total 10,140 acres.

In *Arkansas*, state parks and preserves total 20,199 acres.

In *California*, state parks and similar areas total 519,750 acres.

In *Connecticut*, state parks and monuments total 15,642 acres, and 101 acres in 143 waysides.

In *Delaware*, there is one small state park of two acres.

In *Florida*, state parks and monuments total 32,349 acres, plus the Royal Palm State Park of 4,000 acres administered by the Federation of Women's Clubs.

In *Georgia*, state parks total 23,603 acres.

In *Idaho*, state parks total 7,905 acres and state forests 50,000 acres.

In *Illinois*, state parks and memorials total 28,552 acres, and state forests 10,315 acres.

In *Indiana*, state parks and memorials total 38,056 acres; state forests 127,746 acres, and 288 acres in 96 state waysides.

In *Iowa*, state parks, monuments, lake preserves and waysides total 35,208 acres and state forests 13,350 acres.

In *Kansas*, state parks, forests and game preserves total 39,533 acres, with 121 acres in 23 waysides.

In *Kentucky*, state parks total 23,407 acres and state forests 12,000 acres.

In *Louisiana*, state parks and waysides total 10,649 acres.

In *Maine*, state parks total 12,659 acres, plus Baxter State Park of 116,821 acres and 117 acres in public buildings.

In *Maryland*, state parks total 4,042 acres and state forests 117,790 acres with an 1,800 acre forest administered by the University of Maryland and an historic site of 2 acres under a commission.

In *Massachusetts*, state parks and forests total 94,791 acres plus reservations amounting to 13,694 acres.

In *Michigan*, state parks and recreation acres total 151,546 acres, plus Mackinac Island parks of 2,000 acres and 331 acres in state forests.

In *Minnesota*, state parks, monuments and similar areas total 82,875 acres, state forests 1,516,788 acres, with 183 acres in 37 waysides.

In *Mississippi*, state parks total 11,009 acres.

In *Missouri*, state parks total 29,939 acres, state forests, 115,219 acres, with 146 acres in 35 waysides.

In *Montana*, the Lewis and Clark Cavern State Park contains 2,777 acres with 87 acres in 4 waysides.

In *Nebraska*, state parks and recreation grounds total 8,338 acres with 44 acres in 7 waysides.

In *Nevada*, state parks and waysides total 11,520 acres.

In *New Hampshire*, state parks, forests and reservations total 37,625 acres.

In *New Jersey*, state parks and forests total 75,082 acres plus the New Jersey part of the Palisades Interstate Park of 1,775 acres.

In *New Mexico*, two state parks total 2,693 acres, state monuments 298 acres with 53 acres in 16 waysides.

In *New York*, state parks total 163,625 acres and forest preserves 2,405,265 acres, with 528 acres in historic sites.

In *North Carolina*, state parks and similar areas amount to 35,309 acres.

In *North Dakota*, state parks, recreation areas and historic sites total 3,514 acres.

In *Ohio*, state parks and recreation areas amount to 40,494 acres; state forests, 132,636 acres; state memorials, 3,154 acres; and 1,675 acres in two metropolitan parks.

In *Oklahoma*, state parks and monuments total 43,851 acres plus Will Rogers Park of 27 acres and 140 acres in 46 waysides.

In *Oregon*, state parks, forests and monuments under the Highway Commission total 63,119 acres and state forests under the Board of Forestry 390,250 acres.

In *Pennsylvania*, state parks, forest parks and picnic areas amount to 86,701 acres.

In *Rhode Island*, state parks, parkways, forests and historic sites amount to 26,604 acres, with 89 acres in 19 waysides.

In *South Carolina*, state parks and waysides total 37,419 acres.

In *South Dakota*, Custer State Park comprises 128,000 acres.

In *Tennessee*, state parks total 118,177 acres.

In *Texas*, state parks total 59,187 acres, state forests 6,483 acres, with 1,000 acres in 519 waysides.

In *Utah*, there is one historic site and 4 waysides totalling 15 acres.

In *Vermont*, state parks and forests total 52,822 acres.

In *Virginia*, state parks total 25,051 acres, with a 1,400 acre park administered by the College of William and Mary and 125 acres in 29 waysides.

In *Washington*, state parks, historic monuments and 9 waysides comprise 47,725 acres.

In *West Virginia*, state parks total 38,368 acres, state forests 59,444 acres and 8 waysides amounting to 14 acres.

In *Wisconsin*, state parks and forests total 272,111 acres with 496 acres in 124 waysides.

In *Wyoming*, state parks cover 57 acres.

In 1947, 100,812 acres were acquired by the several States to add to state park and forest systems. Of this area, 51,043 acres were acquired by purchase; 14,844 by gift; 17,215 by transfer; and 17,710 otherwise. Acreages acquired by purchase, gift or transfer were as follows: Alabama–3,740; California–3,186; Connecticut–21; Florida–15,978; Georgia–148; Illinois–85; Indiana–557; Iowa–249; Kentucky–899; Louisiana–750; Maine–10,740; Maryland–1; Michigan–20,862; Minnesota–128; Montana–15; Nebraska–640; New Hampshire–919; New Jersey–939; New York–1,712; Ohio–7,365; Oregon–670; Pennsylvania–5,721; South Dakota–24,840; Tennessee 343; Texas–21; Washington–27; West Virginia 100; Wisconsin–156.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—These figures are condensed from statistics gathered by the Branch of Lands, National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior.

For history of the National Conference on State Parks, see Twenty-fifth Anniversary Year Book, issued in 1947.

For Proceedings of the 27th Annual Meeting of the National Conference on State Parks, held at Bear Mountain, N. Y., October 7–9, 1947, see Part II of October–December, 1947 PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT.

COUNTY AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING

The Metropolitan Region at the Crossroads

PAUL WINDELS, President of the Regional Plan Association, New York, N. Y.

I SHOULD like to talk briefly about the New York Metropolitan Region. It includes the five counties of New York City and the 17 counties which surround it—of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut—in all, about 7,500 square miles. Contained within it are over 500 separate units of local government serving a population of 13,500,000 persons of whom approximately 7,800,000 live in New York City and 5,700,000 in the 17 adjoining counties.

We estimate that by 1973 there will be an increase in population in the City of 700,000 and in the 17 counties of an additional 1,300,000.

Because of the decreasing size of the average family, it requires more housing units than heretofore to accommodate a given number of people and to provide for this increase we shall need, by 1973, 300,000 additional living units in the City and 800,000 in the 17 counties.

This population increase with its 1,100,000 additional living units and related business, industrial, recreational and institutional facilities, will be equivalent to the creation, within this metropolitan region, of 40 new municipalities of the present size of Stamford, Conn., White Plains, N. Y., or Montclair, N. J.,—more than 500 square miles of new development, all within the next 25 years.

This will give you a picture of the magnitude of the problems of expansion with which we are confronted here in the New York region, and what I shall say will have application to other metropolitan areas throughout the Nation. In them now live almost half of the Nation's population. They have increased two and one-half times in population since the turn of the century.

Recently Mr. F. J. Osborn of England, a very distinguished friend and an international leader in the field of regional and city planning, came to visit us and to see what was going on in this country. On the eve of his return to his home he addressed the members of the Regional Plan Association. He made some informal but very interesting observations on the state of urban and regional planning in this country, pointing out that sometimes in the field of human endeavor such as the one we are interested in, advocates of progress have to go along for many years with apparently little to show for their efforts. Then, for some reason or other, the political or social climate changes and by a combination of circumstances or events, the door of opportunity is suddenly opened and it becomes possible to make notable progress. Mr. Osborn said that had been the experience of city and regional planners in England and he wondered, if the same situation were to arise in this country,

whether we would be ready for it. It was his observation that the public's interest in abstract ideas is limited and to be ready to seize opportunities if and when they come, our thinking must be advanced to the point where we know what we are aiming at.

Must we not confess that there is a good deal of truth in this comment? Let us consider it in its application to this area and ask ourselves what we would do if there were suddenly placed at our disposal the means to effectuate comprehensive regional planning here. What are the conditions with which we are here confronted?

We observe, as I pointed out a moment ago, that the process of urban growth continues. How long and how far it will grow and spread, we do not know, but we believe our estimate of a total increase of 2,000,000 persons in this region in the next quarter century is reasonable.

What are the dominant characteristics of this growth? We have first, the centers or cores of the area: New York City, Newark and a half dozen smaller but substantial municipalities. In them all we find a trend from the center of the city either toward its periphery or out of the city. People are steadily moving farther away from the central places of employment. A striking illustration of this is the fact that whereas in the 15 year period (1925–1940) population in the area increased 26 percent, the built up area increased 56 percent. People want more residential space to move around in.

The simple truth is the centers of cities are becoming outmoded for residential purposes. It is not yet economically practicable to modernize them without vast public subsidies and the population simply drifts away, but the major part of it comes back to the centers for employment.

So that the chief characteristic of our present day trend is the constantly increasing distance between places of residence and places of employment and recreation. This means an enormous amount of travel for this single reason, congesting our railroads and our city transportation systems, increasing tremendously the number of bus lines and making travel on our arterial vehicular highways at times almost an impossibility. Within this region our combined means of transportation bring daily more than four million people from outlying areas to central points for work or recreation.

We estimate an increase in our commuter population to and from New York City, if present trends continue, of 70,000 additional daily travelers by 1973 which means approximately 70 more commuter trains twice a day. How they can be provided for in view of existing congestion, nobody yet knows. It is also estimated that by 1960 our automobile traffic may be double that of today and nobody knows where the money is coming from to double our highway and parking facilities.

Obviously this increase in daily travel cannot go on forever at the accelerating rates of the past years. We cannot keep on forever creating more and more facilities for the mounting tidal wave of population

surging toward the few regional centers in the morning and out again at night. There must be some limit to the financial ability of States and municipalities to increase transportation and vehicular facilities to meet the needs not only of more people, but of longer journeys by people as a daily routine. As a matter of sheer physical and financial necessity, part of the solution of our traffic and transportation problem will have to be found in avoiding much of the increase of travel by better organization of the region.

The problem is not necessarily one of mere numbers of people. It is primarily due to the basically wrong design of our metropolitan area and the way in which the comings and goings of the population are organized. What happens when cities grow? Invariably their population spreads out over the surrounding terrain like a solid flow of lava. They are mere formless sprawls. There is no direction to their growth. They simply spread in every direction and, in their progress, overwhelm everything that lies in their paths with a type of intensive and continuous development basically resembling the older parts of the city.

In the areas surrounding such cities are often found small, attractive towns and villages, each with its own clearly defined boundaries, traditions and interests where at least some degree of local, intimate community life is maintained.

As the overwhelming mass of city population moves toward each of these and over it, it is enveloped and absorbed and ultimately becomes another indistinguishable part of the great metropolitan sprawl. Soon its attractive old homes become rooming houses and funeral parlors, its streets gasoline alleys for through traffic. The old city pattern is perpetuated and extended creating an increasing number of urban wanderers, on the move, seeking places less obsolete, but ever more remote, in which to live. Every person here can recall in his own metropolitan area, small communities which have had that fate.

With that type of urban sprawl and the disappearance of these smaller distinctive communities into the conglomerate urban mass, come the problems, human, political, social and financial, which plague us today and will press on us with increasing weight unless we control and correct them. In these surroundings of the formless mass development of metropolitan regions arise and anti-social mass emotions which sweep such areas. There is little in them of human scale and participation that people can cling to and build their lives on. They need living conditions based less on anonymity and more on intimate community life and association to rekindle a sense of individual dignity and social responsibility.

Now it is evident that provision will have to be made for the growth which we face. What shall it be? Shall we let population continue to spread aimlessly as it has, repeating in new areas all of the mistakes of the past, letting congestion pile on congestion and confusion on confu-

sion, until the whole system breaks down, either through impossible crowding or municipal bankruptcy? Or shall we try to channel this growth of population into a more human and better coordinated pattern?

The New York metropolitan area is today at the crossroads. This may be the best, it may also be the last opportunity for an effective decision as to our future. Building, held back for years because of depression, war and inflation, is now under way. New development will either help to achieve the better metropolitan region, or it will make it more difficult even impossible to attain. Is this metropolitan region to become finally and permanently a massive and monolithic structure keyed largely to a few centers with a daily ebb and flow of millions of people to those relatively small areas, or is it to develop as a metropolitan region of many centers of housing, trade, industry and recreation, each clearly defined with its own distinctive identity with people living closer to places of work and possessing greater opportunities for intimate participation in home community life?

Surely, if we allow the growth of the next quarter century to directly attach itself to the huge agglomeration we now have, our problems of congestion, traffic, parking, transportation, municipal services and recreational facilities will be intensified beyond our ability to solve—at least at any cost we would be able or willing to meet.

In sheer financial self-defense, and even more important, for more desirable living conditions, we must channel and guide this new growth in such a manner that we create many new regional centers instead of piling up our growth around a few centers.

From all our study of this problem, we in the Regional Plan Association know that the additional growth takes place continually on the outskirts of previously built-up areas. The continuation of this trend is actually in force in the building now under way.

This continuous spread and sprawl of the city over the countryside should not be accepted as inevitable—it is not inevitable, unless we will it or by our default, tolerate it.

In the London metropolitan area they propose to meet this threat but by methods which to us seem arbitrary. Certainly we would not be prepared in this country, to favor the execution of metropolitan planning by having government appropriate all development rights in all land. We still believe in private initiative and the free enterprise system. But what we can do is to agree on some fundamental principles and broad objectives and then use such public and private instrumentalities as are available to us or within the reasonable range of governmental authority and move toward the achievement of those ends.

The specific point I am making is that as against disorganized sprawl of the City of New York, the City of Newark, Paterson, Stamford, White Plains, or any other municipality within this region as a method of accommodating its growth, overwhelming and absorbing the small towns

in their orbit, first that we deliberately set about to preserve the essential identity and character of these small towns. I was told recently of the case of Bronxville which had the foresight to surround itself almost completely with publicly owned open spaces. That community is not in danger of being overwhelmed and losing its identity. Second: that we channel a major part of the region's growth toward a much larger number of centers. Third: that we deliberately design and create entirely new and distinctive self-sufficient communities for the purpose of accommodating a substantial part of our regional growth.

This last may sound like a radical proposal, impossible of accomplishment but there is nothing radical or impossible about it. It has heretofore been done and is being done now by the development of large scale private residential projects, by building up residential areas around great industries and by relating new industrial plants or business enterprises to new communities.

I believe the next major development in the field of planning in this metropolitan region will be when the governing authorities in each of our three States have the courage, imagination and foresight to apply, on a larger scale, to the creation of entire towns and communities the procedures we are learning to use in urban redevelopment projects under statutes expressly designed for the wholesale redevelopment of blighted areas within cities. This is a field which calls for state leadership. We shall have to approach this problem of sane and better organized living in metropolitan areas on a much larger and more comprehensive scale than heretofore. We must raise our sights and make bold and courageous plans for the deliberate and designed creation of well organized, self-sufficient, independent communities providing in them not only for residential needs but all the requirements of a rounded community life including employment.

As a next step I should like to see one of our great insurance companies lend its aid to an enterprise of that size in cooperation with one of the States and one or more industries seeking more favorable location and modernized design and setting within the region.

This is not decentralization. It is creating new centers to provide for our future growth. There will always be a tremendous number of people who will want to live in the great cities which will have their purposes and serve particular needs. But what we must do, instead of concentrating all of the employment of our increased population on, perhaps, only a half dozen centers, is to spread it out and let the increase find its residence and employment in 50 or more intelligently planned and developed centers throughout the region—some of them new towns. This will make for efficiency, economy in operation, reduction of congestion and infinitely pleasanter lives for the people.

And we have the problem of our great cities. In New York City alone, 16½ square miles of blighted areas. In the region, a total of 25

square miles of blight. What are we to do with them? Of course we must rebuild them, but today it costs approximately $10,000 a unit and if we were to provide modernized housing for all of the people presently living in these areas, the total cost would be five billion dollars, a substantial part of it an outright subsidy. With land and building costs as they are today, we simply cannot rebuild blighted areas exclusively with private capital and barely with public capital, unless with such concentrations of population per acre in the new housing as to threaten the creation of new blighted areas.

What we shall have to aim for in the rebuilding of our urban centers, just as in the building of new towns, is clearly defined neighborhood units. Decades ago New York City consisted of many such neighborhood communities with their separate village and town origins.

Our redevelopment has heretofore been entirely by individual projects not yet big enough to create distinctive neighborhood patterns.

We have been shortsighted in placing all our reliance on housing. People do not live in housing alone. To live normal, wholesome lives they should also live in communities. We have made notable progress in the development of modernized housing but we must build communities with all the features that make possible a well-rounded community life.

You may well ask, "assuming we decided to build our new areas and rebuild our older areas along the lines you have suggested, how can we do it? How can we achieve balanced metropolitan development without a drastic curtailment of local municipal autonomy and free enterprise, such as is today being experimented with in England?"

Well, we shall have to work it out in the American way under our American system of government and constitutional powers. We need first a policy and a purpose. To date, there has been no policy of metropolitan development behind state or Federal housing and redevelopment legislation. Every Federal law affecting urban development, and every state housing and redevelopment corporation law, must be tested for its application to orderly metropolitan growth. Statutory policies and aids are required for the encouragement of public and private capital in this field. In this region it is primarily the problem of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. And unofficial citizens' organizations, such as the Regional Plan Association, have an important role to play in acting as an impartial neutral ground where Federal, state, county, local and private representatives meet and work out matters of joint interest affecting regional development.

We must have in the development of our metropolitan areas the kindred and supremely important objectives of the reestablishment of neighborhood life in our cities, the creation of new towns, the preservation of our smaller regional communities and the wider distribution of employment throughout the region. Along this path lies the hope of a wholesome development of all metropolitan areas.

The South Points the Way

THOMAS H. REED, Municipal Consultant, Wethersfield, Conn.

THERE was a time, well within the memory of many present today, when city planners, very much absorbed in the new field of regional planning, were almost blithely negligent of the need of governmental integration of metropolitan areas if the fine plans for them were to be carried out. Such was the situation a quarter century ago when I, a stranger from the foreign land of political science, was brought to a National Conference on Planning to talk on what many thought the extraneous subject of the government of metropolitan areas.

Since that time we have all traveled a long way. Many regional planning bodies, official and nonofficial, have been created. Many regional plans have been evolved by the genius of the growing host of planners. Some few of them have been given a measure of effect in the rapid development of the areas to which they apply. At the same time there has come a growing sense of the need of units of government with taxing, spending and police powers coordinate with the areas planned, if planned development of metropolitan areas is to become an everyday actuality.

Parallel with this degree of progress among the planners, men and women of my profession have done a great deal of writing and talking about the political integration of metropolitan communities. It must be admitted, however, that the rising chorus of discussion, in which the planners have from time to time chimed in, has been almost without tangible results. There is scarcely a subject, unless it be the weather, on which more has been said and less done than metropolitan consolidation. Since Denver absorbed a large part of Arrapahoe County into the City and County of Denver in 1916, until 1947 when Baton Rouge and East Baton Rouge Parish voted to consolidate, not a single integrated metropolitan government was established in the United States. In this period a successful attempt at federation of existing units in a metropolitan area was made in Berlin, and unsuccessful attempts along somewhat similar lines in Pittsburgh and St. Louis. In the meantime normal city expansion by annexation came to a full stop except in certain States which will be referred to later. We municipal reformers must take our share of the blame for this. We so overemphasized and distorted the sound principle of municipal home rule that it has come to mean the right of the people of any unit, no matter how inadequate or inefficient, to veto any alteration of its status or change of its boundaries.

In fact, with the exceptions which are the subject of this paper, the only changes in the picture of metropolitan disintegration in a generation have been some *functional* consolidations, that is the provision of specific governmental services on a metropolitan scale by existing or newly

created agencies. There have been established, for example, a number of regional or metropolitan planning agencies. It is relatively easy to get this done because the need for the planning is obvious and a new regional agency deprives no one of a job or breaks in any respect the pattern of political life. There are also an increasing number of metropolitan agencies supplying water, sewers and other of the more imperative needs of metropolitan communities. I have no wish to belittle the achievements of planners and others who have brought into being these *ad hoc* metropolitan agencies. They are useful in meeting immediate emergencies. But I do say emphatically that they do not constitute, singly or in the aggregate, a solution of the metropolitan problem. They may in fact actually serve to delay that solution by removing the strongest pressures for it. The goal, as essential to well executed planning as to any other function of local government, is obviously a single integrated government for each metropolitan community. Only such a simple scheme, eliminating all duplication, overlapping activities and unwieldy political complexity can give the metropolitan area really economical and efficient administration. I think it will hardly be disputed that any system which wastes the public's money in these days of crushing taxation is a handicap to all constructive community development.

If we are to have the highways and bridges, the plazas, the parks, the schools, the libraries, the recreation centers, of which all planners write and talk so eloquently, we cannot afford to waste one unnecessary dollar on superfluous employees or overlapping agencies. To the attainment of this end we are not much nearer in 1948 than 30 years ago. *Ad hoc* metropolitan authorities tend to increase the cost of government and to complicate the already too burdensome job of the citizen in a democracy. Only where a function of metropolitan scope has been assigned to an existing unit of government, such as a county embracing the metropolitan area, has functional consolidation made substantial progress toward the desired goal.

In this connection a word should be said about the notion of metropolitan *federalism.* So bitter has been the opposition of outlying units to merger with their nucleus city that attempts have been made sometimes to bypass local particularism by preserving the identity of all such units and guaranteeing them certain powers as the price for their acquiescence in the creation of a consolidated city government of limited jurisdiction. Such a plan has been in existence in London for over half a century. Greater Berlin, established on a similar basis, had a brief self-governing history before Hitler. There is a trace of the same idea in the relatively small sutonomous powers of the New York borough-presidents. Two mighty attempts, however, to apply the federated principle to the Pittsburgh and St. Louis areas, came to nothing in 1929 and 1930. Concessions to the existing outlying units, in both cases all too large from the point of view of efficiency and economy of operation,

failed to overcome suburban hostility to any form of merger. I am not such a perfectionist as to reject all idea of compromise in the democratic process of establishing new units of government. It would be idle to attempt to conceal, too many of you know the facts, that I was the director of research for both the Pittsburgh and St. Louis movements, and that I accepted willingly not all the concessions made to suburban intransigeance but a substantial part of them. I might under similar circumstances do the same again. It is a fact, however, and I am glad of this opportunity to bear witness to it, that there is no hope of reducing overhead and saving expense except in an outright centralization of authority in a single agency for the whole metropolitan area, or as much of it as can be brought together on a practical basis. There may be other grounds for a merger. The establishment of the central unit may be a step toward complete and more efficient consolidation. But any talk about the financial advantages of such a complicated system of government as was contemplated in the St. Louis and Pittsburgh plans is so much nonsense.

This doubtless seems like a pretty gloomy prospect for the political integration of metropolitan communities. There are just three rays of hope in the situation. First, the planners have come to recognize the necessity of such integration and the planners are a persuasive and influential lot. Second, there is more talk about city-county consolidation today than ever before, mostly in the South—Atlanta, Houston, Tampa, Birmingham, Miami, Jacksonville. Third, there are besides the well-known and now almost historic examples of city-county consolidation—San Francisco, Philadelphia, Baltimore, St. Louis, New York, and Denver—other actual working examples of urban integration, some well established and one already voted and soon to take effect, to which consideration must be given.

It is surprising that so little is known in the remainder of the United States, even among those who should be most interested in the matter, of the unique scheme of local government in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The mother of presidents, alone among the 48 States, has drawn a clear-cut line between urban and rural government. It has county government for rural areas and city government for urban areas. Its county governments, in accordance with recent legislation, may exercise many powers of a municipal order and modern forms of county organization, including the county manager plan, are optional with the people of the county. One almost totally urbanized county, Arlington, makes shift to get along with only a county government, and a few other counties have adopted modern forms and extended municipal services to a portion of their population. By and large, however, county government in Virginia is still of the traditional variety and is the only government provided for the great bulk of the rural population. The law allows for the creation of incorporated towns within counties which bear the

usual relation of municipalities to the units in which they are situated. Cities, however, (and in Virginia a second-class city need have no more than 5,000 population and a first-class city 10,000), are independent of the county or counties in which they are located geographically. They are in fact city-counties and there is no overlap in their activities and those of the neighboring counties, except that they may share the services of a circuit judge or enter into contract arrangements as to the use of jails, almshouses, etc.

There is room for argument, of course, that the Virginia law places the dividing line too low. A village of 5,000 inhabitants is perhaps too small to be expected to support its own judicial establishment, its own registry of deeds, and its own provision for the poor and the delinquent. Inter-unit cooperation being made easy in Virginia, partially, at least, obviates this objection. As applied to the larger cities of the State, the Virginia plan of city-county separation works admirably.

And that is not all. City population, in Virginia as elsewhere, spills over the narrow confines of the municipality into the county or counties outside. In most States there is no adequate provision for recapturing this migrant population. Annexation is well nigh impossible where a vote of the people of the outlying area is necessary to extending the city boundaries. Annexation usually means an immediate increase in tax rates and the suburbanite typically cannot see beyond this immediate inconvenience to the long-run advantages to be derived by the whole community from a merger. He instinctively votes "no" and is further stimulated to do so by the vociferous opposition to annexation from his natural political leaders, the county officeholders who cling desperately to the *status quo*. In Virginia, however, annexations occur with great regularity because instead of the issue being left to be decided by the parties to it, the decision is put up to a court of justice. This court consists of three judges—the judge of the local circuit court and two other circuit judges assigned to the duty by the supreme court of the State. The question of annexation is settled therefore on its merits by a court which, after hearing testimony and argument, determines whether the annexation is "necessary and expedient."

The expansion of urban population is a continuing phenomena in Virginia. Not even the Virginia system can quite keep pace with it. But in Virginia annexations to the principal cities have been frequent enough to prevent those extremes of metropolitan disintegration which characterize most other States. In the last ten years Richmond, Petersburg, Portsmouth, Roanoke and many smaller cities have made extensive additions to their boundaries. The courts have almost invariably decided annexation suits in favor of the city seeking the annexation. This should cause no surprise to city planners who know, if anyone does, the desperate need that exists for keeping city boundaries in line with the spread of urban population. County politicians, and to some extent

county residents in Virginia, are inclined to regard this favoring of the city viewpoint as an unjustifiable bias and vigorous attempts have been made, especially at the recent session of the legislature, to weaken the annexation statute. In spite of the fact that the rural counties are heavily over-represented in the general assembly, the law continues to stand.

The court has authority to give the city either more or less territory than it has asked for. Sometimes a city seeks to avoid taking a bit of territory which, because of its lowly economic status, promises to be a burden on the city treasury. The boundary requested by the city council of Richmond in the annexation proceeding against Henrico County in 1940, for example, left out a delapidated negro subdivision close to the old city line. Mr. Bartholomew and I, who were witnesses for the city, felt obliged to testify that this section should be included and the court included it. The courts take the position that the lean must be taken with the fat. On the other hand, the courts have been equally clear that the city cannot be obliged to take the lean without the fat. In spite of the bitter resistance in some instances of the owners of industrial properties to being included in the city, on the ground that the city could give them little if any service, the courts have held such industrial areas to be "suitable for urban development" and have included them. The latest decision on this point was in the case of Portsmouth which in its annexation case, tried in 1946, sought to include the great Norfolk Naval Shipyard and an adjacent area already occupied for the most part by several industries. The U. S. Government took no part in the case but the attorneys for Norfolk County urged that the navy yard was not even in the State of Virginia and the attorneys for the private industries stressed the point that they neither needed nor wanted city services. The trial court however, awarded both areas to the city along with a large but nonadjacent residential section and the supreme court of the State in a sweeping decision upheld the action of the lower court. The cities of Virginia are thus able to assume responsibility for the development of the residential sections in their environs and at the same time to acquire the industrial areas whose assessed valuations make it possible to pay for the services required in the residential areas annexed.

The Virginia law provides specifically against neglect of the annexed area as a whole once it has become a part of the city. The city is forbidden to increase the tax rate in the area annexed for five years and is required to spend all the revenue derived from taxes and licenses collected in the area during that period on permanent public improvements in the area. An alternative, however, is provided. If the city decides to spend the equivalent of 12 percent of the assessed valuation of real estate in the area on an immediate program of public improvements in the area, it may, upon substantial completion of the improvements, apply its own tax rate and absorb all the revenues from the area in its general fund.

Under this plan the city has one or two instead of five years in which it must meet the increased operating expense due to the annexation without the benefit of increased tax and license revenues. Even with this handicap annexation is a cardinal policy of progressive Virginia municipalities. In Virginia integrated metropolitan areas are a fact. The only fly in the ointment is that the annexation law applies only to unincorporated territory and incorporated towns, not to cities which can be annexed only by vote to their citizens. However, actual conditions in the State are such that this has so far proved no serious bar to the integration of Virginia's urban centers.

Virginia has been pursuing its constructive policy with regard to city growth for many years. That it has found no imitators is significant of the bad thinking we have had on the subject of home rule and local self-government. There are some other States, notably Texas and Missouri, where annexation of unincorporated areas is relatively easy. In Texas it requires only a resolution of the city council, in my opinion a too facile means of city expansion. Recent considerable annexations have been made to Dallas, Houston and other cities. In Missouri unincorporated territory may be annexed by a court proceeding, but, unfortunately, the existence of many small municipalities has made this proceeding inapplicable to the St. Louis area, though Kansas City is resorting to it in a current attempt to annex an area north of the Missouri River.

The successful use of either of these methods depends, where the law encourages the incorporation of very small places, on the extreme farsightedness of the city council. It has to resolve to go out and take territory thinly populated and often financially detrimental to the city, at the risk of seeing a series of minute municipalities spring up to block its progress. This tendency is obviated in Virginia by the fact that the minimum population of a city is 5,000 and that to become a city the taxpayers must be prepared to assume the usual responsibilities of a county as well as a city government.

The movement for city-county consolidation had been practically fruitless for a generation prior to 1947, when civic leaders of Baton Rouge, La., took the bit in their teeth, outwitted the politicians, and forced a merger of the city and the parish of East Baton Rouge in which the city was situated. The city of Baton Rouge, about four square miles in extent, had a population of approximately 30,000. It was developed practically to capacity and there had grown up around it a very unevenly developed region about six times the area and two and one-half times the population of the original city. All this was part of the parish of East Baton Rouge, with an area of about 600 square miles and a population, including the city, of 110,000 to 115,000. The mushroom growth of the Baton Rouge community was due to the enormous development of the Standard Oil Refinery, employing upwards of 8,000,

and other associated chemical industries located in a compact section outside the city free from residential development and in which the ordinary municipal services such as streets, sewers, lights, police and fire protection, were provided by the industries themselves, at their own expense. The population growth had taken place without plan or regulation of any kind. I have seen many metropolitan situations, all sorts of manifestations of the out-thrust of urban population, but I have never seen anything to compare in its disorder to that in the area surrounding Baton Rouge—subdivisions without sewers or pavements, jerry-built houses, twenty-foot lots, no water for fire protection, and all without the slightest pretense of coordination in street layout even in adjacent tracts, and a most inadequate provision for through-traffic.

Leading spirits in the Chamber of Commerce, of which J. Theron Brown was then President and the late Will Longwill, Secretary, saw the disaster toward which all this unplanned and uncontrolled growth was leading. They decided to have a plan and for that purpose organized a City Parish Planning Committee with representatives of the city council, parish police jury, East Baton Rouge Parish school board, and the state department of public works. This body engaged Harland Bartholomew and Associates to make a thorough planning study of the metropolitan area. That study has now been completed and Baton Rouge has a chart by which to guide its future development. Long before the Bartholomew report was completed, however, the city-parish plan committee, encouraged in this by Mr. Bartholomew himself, decided that if the plans being made were to be carried out, an effective and integrated government for the metropolitan area must be set up: in other words, that having a chart they needed a charter of comparable dimensions. Mrs. Reed and I were fortunate enough to get the assignment for the governmental study. At the very outset it was apparent that nothing in the way of consolidation could be done without an enabling constitutional amendment and one was prepared, passed at the 1946 session of the Louisiana legislature and ratified by the voters of the State at the congressional election in the fall of that year.

Three things about this amendment were specially important. First, while it gave the charter commission which was authorized ample power to create, abolish or consolidate units of government and provide for their organization, it gave it no authority to create new powers but limited it to the distribution of the powers already conferred on local government by the constitution and laws of the State. Second, it made it mandatory to create three areas for tax purposes—urban, rural and industrial—and provided that the constitutional limitation on taxation for cities should apply in the urban, and that for parishes in the rural and industrial areas. Third, it provided for ratification of the plan of government to be drafted by the commission by majority vote in a parish-wide election. It must be admitted that the proponents of con-

solidation slipped one over on the politicians, especially in this matter of the method of ratification. Had the politicos realized what was going to happen, the amendment would have been strangled at birth.

We found, when we began our study, a city government on the commission plan as established by general law. There was a mayor who was also commissioner of public safety, a commissioner of streets and parks and a commissioner of finance. The city government was not badly conducted, but it was feeble administratively and financially. It was rendering very mediocre service to its 30,000 inhabitants, largely because it lacked the resources to pay for better ones. The parish, with the vast properties of the Standard Oil and other industries to tax, was in better shape financially, but badly organized and inefficiently operated. Its governing body was a police jury, elected by wards, in which the rural population was heavily overrepresented. It had no executive head. Its very considerable expenditures on roads and other public works were apportioned among the several wards and administered by the police jurors thereof, a method well adapted to the needs of a rural parish of pre-Civil War days, but wasteful and inefficient under modern conditions. Almost no one, even among its own members, had a good word to say for the police jury.

I shall not take your time to describe the difficulties under which the charter commission labored, the political pressures which were exerted on it, the grim determination which ultimately produced a unique and acceptable solution for the problem of consolidation. What interests you is the result.

The charter as adopted preserves the separate identity of both the city and the parish. The reason for this was purely fiscal. There would in any event have had to be a differential in tax rate between the urban area, to which the city corresponds, and the industrial and rural areas. There was, in addition, the very practical motive that a complete merging of the parish in a city government would have deprived taxpayers of the homestead exemption enjoyed by them under the Louisiana constitution in respect of parish but not city taxes. If this had been done there would have been no chance of carrying the charter at the polls. The retention of separate identity, however, was not allowed to produce any real division of authority or any duplication of activities or costs. The city council is to consist of seven members elected at large from the enlarged city—30 square miles instead of 4, and 106,000 population instead of 30,000. The parish council is to consist of the same seven persons who are members of the city council, plus two additional members—one elected from the northern and one from the southern section of the parish outside the city.

There are separate budgets and separate tax levies for the city and parish. The city budget provides for certain services to be rendered within the city, which constitutes the urban area, such as police and

fire protection, sewers and garbage collection and disposal. The parish budget includes the general overhead of government and the very important service of roads and bridges both inside and outside the city. Each council adopts its own budget and levies its own taxes, but the composition of the two is such that, though legally distinct, they are practically one and the same. Unity in policy is thus assured.

Nor is there any duplication in administration. The chief executive officer is to be a mayor-president elected by the parish at large. He presides over the meetings of both councils. He prepares and submits their respective budgets. He appoints and removes, without council confirmation, the principal officers of the parish and city—director of finance, director of public works, chief of police, chief of the fire department, and the purchasing agent and personnel administrator. Incidentally, the charter provides the very best in budgetary and accounting procedures, and in purchasing and personnel administration. The chief of police and the chief of the fire departments operate wholly within the city. Police protection outside is provided by the sheriff who is also under the Louisiana constitution the collector of taxes. His office is supported exclusively by fees, principally for collecting taxes, which he spends in his discretion. Unfortunately this anomalous situation was beyond the reach of the charter commission. The director of finance, purchasing agent and personnel administrator are paid from the parish budget and serve both the parish and city governments. The department of public works is unified administratively under its director but it will maintain sewers and collect and dispose of refuse only within the city, and construct and maintain highways and bridges throughout the parish. It will also be responsible for the maintenance of public buildings and the operation of a central garage and repair shop. The cost of these internal services will be charged back to the departments for which the work is done. There is not an inch of overlap in this whole administrative setup. There is a little more bookkeeping necessary than in an ordinary city government, that's all.

The planning commission is to consist of 9 members—4 ex officio (a member of the parish council, the mayor-president or some officer designated by him, a member of the school board, and one designated by the state director of public works) and 5 citizens, three of whom must be residents of the city, appointed by the council for five-year overlapping terms. It is to have the powers of a city planning commission within the city and also the powers of a parish planning commission. It is, in other words, a single body exercising two kinds of jurisdiction. It should be capable of coordinated planning for the whole parish. Parishes do not have zoning powers in Louisiana, so zoning will be carried on for the present only within the enlarged city. This is one point where a single consolidated city-parish would have been preferable if it had been financially feasible.

Parks and recreation are to be conducted on a parish-wide basis by a special park and recreation commission consisting of the mayor-president, the superintendent of schools, a member of the planning commission, and six persons appointed by the parish council. This divergence from the general plan of centralized administrative authority was necessitated by the adoption at the same time as the enabling constitutional amendment of another amendment creating a park and recreation commission for the parish and giving it, with the approval of the voters, the right to levy as much as one mill for park and recreation purposes. This second amendment was not part of the city-parish planning committee's program. As the situation developed, however, any attempt to have defeated it would have seriously endangered the prospects of the enabling amendment.

The plan of government was approved by a majority of the votes cast in a parish-wide election in August, 1947. The parish council and city council will be elected at the same time as members of Congress in the fall of 1948, and the plan will go into effect fully on January 1, 1949 when the terms of office of the present city commissioners expire. There would be no use in denying that, if the question of adopting the new plan of government had been submitted to the voters of the old city and the remainder of the parish separately, it would have been defeated. The third ward went heavily against the plan, the university section and other high-class suburbs south of the city slightly against it, while the city gave it a sufficient majority to more than offset this opposition. Consolidation by popular vote anywhere faces opposition from the outlying population. The majority in favor of the plan was narrow but this is not to be taken too seriously since the overconfident proponents of the plan failed to get out the vote, while the opposition, headed by the sheriff, in a last minute drive got every possible negative vote to the polls. If the plan could have been submitted without misrepresentation and appeals to prejudice, it should have won universal favor. It gave the outlying areas included in the enlarged city, in return for an almost negligible increase in taxation, the assurance of controlled development and efficient municipal services. The plan is unusual but practical. It gets around the problem of differentials in tax rates which are essential if large rural areas are to be combined with urban communities in a single government. Its way of doing so, by maintaining the separate identity of city and parish or county, should be particularly helpful in those States where uniformity in tax rates within the same municipality is a constitutional requirement.

One phase of the plan remains to be discussed—its treatment of the industrial areas. We have already seen that the enabling constitutional amendment made it mandatory to provide for an industrial area or areas in which the rate of taxation was not to exceed that authorized by the constitution for parishes—4 mills on the dollar as contrasted

with 7 mills in the urban area. The enabling amendment was so framed that any compact body of land outside the old city, predominantly used for industrial purposes, in which the usual municipal services were provided exclusively by the owners of the property, must be set up as an industrial area. The plan of government described two such areas, the first was the industrial section occupied by the Standard Oil Co. and kindred industries, just north of the city, and the other a "tank farm" still farther north, owned by the Standard Oil Co. Both areas being outside the city, the tax limitation they are to enjoy under the new plan of government is exactly the same as that enjoyed before. It is to be noted that this limitation applied merely to the "alimony" or general fund tax for operating purposes and does not apply to school taxes or to levies voted by the people for the payment of debt and otherwise which the industrial area pays in common with all other property in the area. It is also true that no municipal services are now rendered in the industrial areas and the new plan of government distinctly prohibits their being so for the future, except emergency police and fire protection rendered in accordance with mutual assistance agreements between the city and the owners of property in the industrial area. The concession to the industries, which admittedly had something to do with their cordial reception of the plan, was after all a slight one.

There is no question but what from the city planners' point of view the industries adjacent to an urban development, from which its growth stems, are an integral part of that urban development. It is also very generally recognized that the taxation to which industries are subject has a direct bearing on the selection of their sites. Relatively low taxes on industry are frequently necessary to preserve their competitive position and by the same token the competitive position of the urban community to which they belong. The fact that so many industries are located just outside of cities is due in large degree to their desire to escape city taxes. When this very common situation exists, however, the city suffers financially because, while its problems are intensified by the presence of the industry, its revenues are not correspondingly enhanced. Planners, industrialists, and city administrators have long been looking for a formula which will give industries a reasonable rate of taxation to preserve their competitive position and which will at the same time give the municipality substantial revenues from these industries.

The Baton Rouge plan as worked out does exactly that. The enabling amendment contained a clause permitting the allocation of parish revenue to city curposes. The charter provided that three of the four mills of parish alimony tax on the industrial area must be allocated to the city. Thus 75 percent of the taxes collected for general purposes from the industrial areas must go to the support of the city. The urban community of Baton Rouge has the advantage of two low tax areas for

industry as a means of keeping and attracting industry, from which areas it derives a substantial revenue. Additional industrial areas, of not less than 320 acres in extent, can be created from the rural area by the parish council on conditions guaranteeing that the area will be predominantly industrial and that all the usual municipal services will be supplied at the cost of the property owners. This will take care of the development anticipated when the deep water canal is cut through above the present industrial areas.

It should be encouraging to those who have been strong for the integration of metropolitan areas that a great act of integration has been consummated in one of the most potential industrial regions of our country. The generation-long deadlock has been broken and the south has led the way.

Metropolitan Planning in St. Louis

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW, City Planner, St. Louis, Missouri

IN 1926 a Regional Planning Federation was formed for the purpose of studying urban planning needs in the area into which population was spreading and which had a radius of approximately fifty miles from downtown St. Louis. This organization had no funds, however, and had a very short life. One small report was issued.

The Federation was succeeded in 1933 by the St. Louis Regional Planning Commission, which cooperated with the National Resources Committee in the preparation of a fairly comprehensive report on "Regional Planning—St. Louis Region." This report was published in 1936. The area covered by this study and plan included the City of St. Louis (which is not a part of any county), St. Louis County, and portions of St. Charles, Franklin and Jefferson Counties in Missouri; Monroe, St. Clair and Madison Counties and a small portion of Jersey County in Illinois. This report has served as a valuable reference base for many highway and outer park improvements during the past ten years. Despite an excellent start this Commission also died a slow death, mainly for lack of funds. It was born of the depression and sustained chiefly by relief funds.

The present Metropolitan Plan Association was formed in 1945 by a group of private interests, chiefly industrial, under the leadership of W. Stuart Symington. The primary purpose of this Association was to promote planned development for the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area, comprising the City of St. Louis, St. Charles and St. Louis Counties in Missouri, and Monroe, St. Clair and Madison Counties in Illinois.

As a result of the Association's activities, the Legislature of Missouri and the Legislature of Illinois have each passed an act authorizing the

establishment of a Bi-State Commission composed of five members to be appointed by the Governor of each State, which Commission shall have the duty:

(a) To prepare a program of organization and administration whereby the affected communities of the area may most effectively plan and guide the development of the area in matters which are of concern to the area as a whole.
(b) To submit the plan herein referred to, to the next session of the General Assembly.

The Commissioners are instructed to give specific attention to and make recommendations as to the advisability of establishing a permanent bi-state administrative body which may have the duty and authority to:

(a) Operative Functions: Plan, construct, maintain, own and operate bridges, and tunnels, airports, terminal facilities, sewerage and drainage facilities.
(b) Advisory Functions: Make plans, for submission to the communities involved, for coordination of streets, highways, parkways, parking areas, terminals, water supply and sewerage disposal works, recreational and conservation facilities and projects, land-use pattern, and other matters in which joint or coordinated action of the communities within the area will be generally beneficial.
(c) Charge and collect fees for use of the facilities owned and operated by said bi-state administrative body; issue bonds upon the security of the revenues to be derived from such facilities; and receive for the lawful activities of said body any contributions or moneys appropriated by municipalities, counties, States, or other agencies.
(d) To disburse funds for the lawful activities of the said body, fix salaries and wages of its employees, and perform all other necessary and incidental functions.

The sum of $25,000 has been appropriated by each State for the use of this Commission.

So much for the planning background. What of the area itself—its problems and its future?

The Area and Its People

Basically, the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area has the characteristics of a single large city. It is an urban community grown large because of advantages of location, natural resources, transportation facilities and the enterprise of its people.

The transition from a series of isolated communities has taken place largely within the last half century. True, the Mississippi River—and the State line—pass through the center of the area. Bridges, telephone and power lines, the airways, and most important of all, a community interest, long ago spanned the river and the state line.

The metropolitan community with which we are concerned forms a widely scattered pattern of commerce, industry, residence, railroads, airports, parks, utilities and institutions. The lack of orderly form is the result of rapid growth.

The area was first settled because of its location at the confluence of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. Its proximity to the great waterways—which were the first lines of travel—insured the early importance of the area. Later, the overland trails converged at St. Louis

and created a great interchange point, thus giving added impetus to the growth of business and industry. The central geographic position of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area and the important river crossing made this location a natural gateway between the East and West. In the early development of railroads this gateway was recognized and became one of the principal centers in the Nation. The importance of this area as a dominant gateway and terminal has subsequently been recognized in the construction of the national highway network and more recently in the establishment of air transportation routes. These have given new significence to the area and have opened further opportunities for the growth of business and industry.

Another reason for the business and industrial growth of the Metropolitan Area is its proximity to many raw materials, particularly coal, oil, lead, zinc, and timber. It is at the center of the Mississippi Valley—the most extensive and largest agricultural section in the Nation. Located between the geographic and population centers of the United States, the area enjoys an unusual position as a national production and distribution center. Because of its outstanding transportation facilities it is one of the major distribution centers of the Nation.

The largest metropolitan areas (those containing one-half million persons or more) which comprised one-fifth of the urban population of the United States in 1890, grew so rapidly that by 1940 they contained one-third of the urban population. Between 1910 and 1940 the two larger cities (St. Louis and East St. Louis) grew only about one-half as fast as the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area. This emphasizes the urgent need for planning on a metropolitan-area basis. The many problems which accompany a concentration of population are no longer confined within the larger cities but are spreading over a much wider area. At present the metropolitan area has an estimated population of 1,648,000. If the present ratio of metropolitan area population to total national population is maintained, the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area would have a population of 1,820,000 in 1980.

The population pattern has developed in a haphazard fashion. Throughout much of the area there has been very little zoning or control of subdivisions. Many areas were developed for homesites where there were no utilities or where the areas could better have been utilized for industry or other purposes. Land uses are badly intermingled in some sections of the area.

Transportation Facilities

Transportation facilities have been a major influence in the growth and development of the Metropolitan Area. Without mass transportation facilities to transport large numbers of persons, the cities' economic life could not function nor could the urban portions have grown as rapidly or as large as they did. It is imperative that local transit operations be

improved and supplemented to serve the expected future growth of the Metropolitan Area.

Mass Transit Facilities. At the present time street car and bus transit facilities are operated by several companies within the area. Coverage is fairly good. The nearest approach to rapid transit is the commuter service operated by one railroad on the Missouri side and by one electric interurban line between St. Louis and a few communities on the east side. No comprehensive study of transit facilities has ever been made for the entire Metropolitan Area. Such a study is needed. The plan developed as a result of this study will probably have to provide for limited service bus routes operating over express highway routes.

Highways. The existing system of Federal, state and county highways and major streets radiates from the central business districts of St. Louis and East St. Louis. The system of radial and inter-connecting routes is unusually good. Four of the transcontinental interstate routes, U. S. 40, U. S. 50, U. S. 61, and U. S. 66, converge in the area. When these are fully improved to modern standards they will not only afford excellent access between the area and all major American cities but will also expedite the movement of large volumes of local traffic.

The area has also made a start in developing local expressways where traffic can move freely without encountering interference either at intersections or from private development along the route.

There is need for a comprehensive highway plan for the entire area with the annual improvement programs constantly correlated with the growth and needs of the area.

Railroads and Terminals. In the 1850's railroad construction reached the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area. Since there were no bridges over the Mississippi, the rapidly increasing number of railroads from the East terminated on the east bank close to the ferry landings. This produced a pattern of sprawling individual railroad yards and terminals along the entire East St. Louis riverfront which continues to this day and complicates the major street pattern and the pattern of industrial development in that portion of the area.

Eads Bridge was opened in 1874, and with the completion of the tracks on the lower decks afforded continuous rail operation from the east coast to Missouri. Subsequently, four more bridges carrying rail facilities have been built across the Mississippi within the Metropolitan Area. On the St. Louis side extensive railroad yards and terminals including the St. Louis Union Station have been constructed in what was once the Mill Creek Valley. Considerable rail development has also taken place along and near the St. Louis riverfront.

This area is the second largest railroad center in the United States. It is served by seventeen trunk line railroads, three short-line routes primarily engaged in the transportation of coal, and five railroads engaged exclusively in switching operations. In addition there are two

electric lines operating in the area, one of which provides commuter and main line passenger service between St. Louis and Illinois points. One of the steam railroads entering St. Louis provides commuter service to nearby points in Missouri. The Terminal Railroad Association owns and operates the St. Louis Union Passenger Station, which is the largest unified passenger terminal in the United States. The Terminal also owns and operates extensive yard facilities and connecting line trackage on both sides of the Mississippi and handles the bulk of the freight interchanged by the railroads. This also is the largest single terminal operating facility in the United States. Direct freight service through the Metropolitan Area is provided by six of the trunk line railroads. The package car system for L.C.L. shipment on lines radiating from St. Louis has been developed into one of the best delivery services afforded by any large city.

As a result of an exhaustive study of and plan for railroad facilities ("Report of Engineers' Committee, St. Louis-East St. Louis Railroad Terminals") made in 1922, important improvements and changes in passenger train routes and improvements in other routings, particularly with respect to river crossings, have been made during the past twenty years. Both terminal and yard facilities—passenger and freight—have been expanded and numerous grade crossings eliminated.

A restudy of the railroad situation is needed at this time, however. The probable needs of the next quarter century should be determined once again and a plan made for the specific improvements required to meet those needs.

Air Transport. Within the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area there are, at the present time, nineteen airfields ranging from small private fields to the two publicly owned major airports (Lambert Field, the St. Louis Municipal Airport, and Scott Field which is owned and operated by the Army). Most of the other airfields are small and the majority of them are located in the outlying portions of the area.

At the Lambert-St. Louis Airport scheduled airline passengers totaled 283,900 in 1947. Five major airlines now provide seventy-four inbound and seventy-four outbound scheduled passenger flights each day at Lambert-St. Louis Airport. Three airlines provide a total of seven inbound and seven outbound scheduled air freight flights each day. At the instance of the St. Louis Airport Commission, a study was made in 1945 of the existing airport facilities and an airport plan for the Metropolitan Area was prepared. In this plan it was estimated that by 1960 facilities must be provided within the Metropolitan Area to handle an annual airline passenger volume of 1,180,000 passengers, 40,000,000 pounds of airmail, and 240,000,000 pounds of air express and freight.

The airport plan recommended a total of thirty-five airports including three fields for major transport operations, one intermediate field for

local service, ten minor airports for non-scheduled and commercial uses, five training fields, three congested area airports, and thirteen personal flying fields. Subsequent to the completion of the report, the CAA has approved the plan with the exception of the congested area airports and one of the minor fields.

If the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area is to attain a dominant position in the air transportation network of the Nation, an adequate system of metropolitan airports must be developed in the very near future.

Motor Truck Traffic. The tremendous increase in registration and use of motor trucks in the United States highlights one of the most spectacular phases of the automobile age. Not only has the registration of motor trucks grown, but the use and utility of such vehicles has greatly increased.

In 1945 there were some 137 trucking companies operating from eight major terminals in St. Louis and about 130 companies operating from individual terminals. In addition, several hundred independent individuals were engaged in transporting livestock, farm produce, coal, etc., into and within the Metropolitan Area. In 1947 more than five million head of livestock passed through the National Stockyards, a majority of which were transported to market in motor trucks. At the present time a new produce market is under consideration in St. Louis. Representatives of the railroads, the commission merchants, and the United States Department of Agriculture have been engaged in studies for a number of months. A very large percentage of farm produce reaches the cities in the Metropolitan Area by truck.

Trucking facilities provide overnight delivery service to points as far distant as 350 miles from St. Louis and East St. Louis. The greater part of the less-than-carload freight moving out of St. Louis to points within 300 miles is handled by motor trucks. In addition to the trucking firms engaged in long-haul or specialized transport, there are more than 125 transfer companies making daily deliveries to firms within the Metropolitan Area.

The extensive use of motor trucks within the urbanized portion of the Metropolitan Area has given rise to a number of problems which will require considerable farther study in order to properly coordinate motor truck usage with other transportation within the Metropolitan Area.

Water Transport. From the time of DeSoto's discovery of the Mississippi in 1541, this largest of all North American rivers has influenced the development of the Metropolitan Area. St. Louis was founded by pioneers who came up from the Gulf in 1763. Until about 1850 the river was the principal channel of transportation and traffic upon which much of the life of the area depended. Many important changes took place during the latter part of the 19th Century. The advent of the railroads

brought about a decline in river traffic. River channels were neglected and no efforts were made to revive river transportation until World War I. Since 1920 many miles of channel have been stabilized and improved on the Mississippi River inland waterway system including the Mississippi, Missouri, the Illinois and the Ohio. This system affords water connections with twenty-nine of the principal industrial centers of the twenty States of the Mississippi Valley with a total population of over thirteen million, and affects by joint river-rail freight rates a population of more than sixty-five million. In 1945 St. Louis was served by thirteen waterway organizations. In addition there were a number of private business firms operating their own equipment into the Metropolitan Area. Four terminals are regularly engaged in handling general cargo, and there are numerous private specialized terminals handling coal, sand and gravel, cement, lumber, oil, ore, bulk chemicals, etc.

There is need for a comprehensive study of the future demands of industries for water-borne freight facilities including terminals within the Metropolitan Area. This study should include investigation of the practicability of a system of combined freight terminals served by barge lines, railroads and motor truck lines.

Public Services and Utilities

The abundant natural water resources within the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area have played an important part in attracting large industries as well as urban population to the Metropolitan Area. The Mississippi and Missouri Rivers provide the principal water supplies. On the Missouri side the Meramec River and local wells are also used. On the Illinois side supplies are obtained from wells and local streams in addition to the Mississippi River. Many of the municipalities own and operate their own water supply systems, while others are served by two large private concerns within the area—the East St. Louis and Interurban Water Company in Illinois, and the St. Louis County Water Company on the Missouri side. In addition to serving many incorporated places, these firms also supply large unincorporated areas. A number of large industries, particularly in the low-lying areas of the Illinois side, have developed wells for their own use. Unlimited quantities of water can be obtained from the gravel strata at depths of 100 to 125 feet below the ground surface. Water temperature is in the neighborhood of sixty degrees and may be used untreated for many manufacturing processes as well as for cooling, condensing or cleaning. Some river water is used without treatment in industries, mainly as cooling water for condensers in power plants. The water resources of the Metropolitan Area are adequate to provide for all future needs.

The several public water supply systems generally furnish satisfactory coverage of urbanized portions of the Metropolitan Area. However, there are undoubtedly localized situations within the area where

interconnections between water supply facilities serving adjacent districts would permit economies in operations as well as give greater assurance of adequate supply in case of water main breaks or plant shutdowns.

The greatest need of a modern city is its water supply, the next most important facility is the sewerage system. Within the Metropolitan Area the larger cities are served by combined sanitary and storm water sewers which empty into the river. Other sewered communities along the river have facilities for accommodating only the sanitary flow. A small percentage of sanitary sewerage receives some treatment prior to discharge into the stream. Communities located at a distance from the river have sewage treatment plants. The greater part of the highly urbanized portion of the Metropolitan Area is served by sewers, but unfortunately there are many cases where property owners have failed to install sanitary facilities connected to the sewers where sewers are available. Due to the lack of overall planning and zoning and proper subdivision controls, the haphazard development of many urbanized parts of the area has resulted in the piecemeal construction of sewerage facilities. Many municipalities and sewer districts with presently inadequate facilities have reached the limit of their taxing authority under existing legislation.

There is need for the establishment of a few large sewer districts combining many of the smaller districts and also including urban or potentially urban areas not now included in sewer districts. In this way it should be possible to attain a more equitable sewer tax assessment throughout the urban area, and would also assist in providing sewers in certain unserved densely populated areas.

There is need for the adoption and enforcement of subdivision controls and minimum standards housing regulations to assure the provision of adequate water supply and sewerage facilities at the time of land subdivision and the maintenance of satisfactory sanitation at all times. Within the Metropolitan Area at the present time only the unincorporated portions of St. Louis County have subdivision controls. The City of St. Louis has a recently enacted minimum standards housing regulation which will not become fully effective until 1950.

Since the time of the first settlements along the Mississippi, parts of the Metropolitan Area, and more particularly the Illinois portion, have been subject to extensive damage from floods. In the early efforts to control flooding, each of the levee districts worked independently, designing and constructing its levees for the immediate need so far as possible with the limited funds available. Since recognition by the Congress in 1936 that flood control is a national responsibility, the base of Federal participation in flood control works on the major rivers has been broadened, and as a result the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with local levee districts, has constructed many improvements and has underway

a program of flood protection works which will eventually remove the menace of flood waters from urban, and much of the agricultural sections in the low-lying portions of the Metropolitan Area. The cost of periodic floods in the Metropolitan Area is tremendous. For example, during the 1947 flood, some 140,000 acres of crop land were inundated. Crop losses amounted to more than $10,000,000, while property damage to farms, livestock, urban development, roads and bridges, railroads and marine transportation amounted to an additional six and a half million, while the cost of evacuation and emergency aid totaled nearly $50,000. In addition to the physical damage suffered due to destructive floods, the interruption to transportation services, losses in essential food production, losses in wages and industrial production, menace to the lives of persons living in areas subject to flooding, and the menace to public health constitute a barrier to the continued development of the Metropolitan Area.

Public Welfare

In 1940 there were 432,000 dwelling units housing a population of approximately 1,445,000 in the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area. Of these, nearly twenty-six percent were built prior to 1900, ten percent had no running water, and approximately eighteen percent had running water but no flush toilet. Within the cities of St. Louis and East St. Louis there are more than 26,000 dwellings where toilet facilities are shared by several families. In common with the great majority of American cities, the communities within the Metropolitan Area have no housing policies and no housing programs other than that of abandonment of old areas and a concurrent movement to new fringe developments. This is an exceedingly wasteful policy and a tragic one because of the poor housing conditions which must be endured by those unable to move to outlying areas. The largest areas of bad housing or slums are found in the cities of St. Louis and East St. Louis. The buildings are very old and in a poor state of preservation and of obsolete design. Sanitary facilities in all of the slum areas are generally inadequate. In many cases sewers are available within those sections, but, due to the lack of minimum-standard housing regulations and their proper enforcement, full advantage has not been taken of sanitary sewers available. Currently, in St. Louis there is considerable agitation for clearance and rebuilding of an extensive slum area adjoining the central business district. Consideration is being given to a municipal bond issue to acquire the property after which the land would be sold at a much reduced price to private interests for development. Both Missouri and Illinois have laws permitting private corporations to acquire and redevelop slum areas under controls as to the type of housing to be built and the amount of open space to be provided.

There is need for a definite and integrated housing program for the

Metropolitan Area. Such a program should include (1) control of new housing construction, (2) rehabilitation of blighted districts, and (3) slum clearance.

An important contribution to the public welfare within the Metropolitan Area is the provision of adequate parks and recreational area. Adequate neighborhood playgrounds and parks must be developed, but in addition large parks and reservations are needed to preserve scenic and wooded areas which have outstanding characteristics and to afford occasional escape from strictly urban environment. Substantial progress has been made in providing recreation areas in the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area during the past fourteen years. In 1934 there were only 6,600 acres of public parks and reservations within or adjoining the Metropolitan Area. There are now slightly more than 22,000 acres. Included are the municipal parks, county and state parks, conservation areas, and one national park (Jefferson National-Expansion Memorial). It is the small recreation areas closely related to the residential sections that are quite inadequate in the Metropolitan Area. Many densely populated sections are without recreation and playground facilities. These are primarily found in older portions of the area but, unfortunately adequate neighborhood parks and playgrounds are not provided for in the new residential developments. Ample vacant area is still available for facilities at a minimum of expenditure in these sections, but unless provided in the near future an unusual opportunity will be lost forever.

Public Administration

Analysis of problems within the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area shows that many of them cannot be satisfactorily solved by local governmental units restricted by political boundaries. Many of the dominant current needs stem mainly from a lack of overall planning and administrative guidance at the metropolitan level.

A new agency of government is urgently needed to give better coordination of and direction to growth and to foster if not to provide certain types of improvements which are peculiarly metropolitan in character. Only by an *interstate compact* can such an agency be established here. Interstate compacts for a specific functional service have been adopted in several other metropolitan areas bisected by state boundary lines. It is not a new or experimental device.

The new agency here visualized would be a top level urban directional and administrative authority. Properly conceived and directed, it should not and must not usurp the functions of local government. It must function only at the metropolitan level. Its initial work should be to explore its most appropriate field of action, to make recommendations to and cooperate with local agencies, and to exercise full administrative authority only where such authority is not otherwise adequately provided.

Comprehensive, area-wide planning is one of the most important fields of action for a metropolitan agency. Within the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan Area there is need for constant area-wide planning for land use, population distribution, transportation facilities and terminals, highways, rapid transit, flood control, sewers and drainage, park and recreation facilities, and housing.

Another important field for a metropolitan agency is that of assistance to and cooperation with local governmental units in improving and extending facilities and services of metropolitan significance. There are many problems of sewerage and drainage, for example, which overlap local municipal boundaries and which a metropolitan agency could assist in planning and organizing.

A third field of action would be in the acquisition, construction and administration of improvements of special metropolitan character.

Governor Green of Illinois has appointed the five members from his State to serve on the Missouri-Illinois Commission and Governor Donnelly of Missouri has recently appointed the five members from his State. It is expected the Commission will start meeting soon and proceed rapidly to undertake and complete its studies. The result of this work should be of special interest to those of us who have been much concerned with the inadequate planning throughout so much of the area of these rapidly growing metropolitan districts—our cities of tomorrow.

Area Planning—A Summary

ALEXANDER ELDER, *Chairman*, Essex County Joint Council of Municipal Planning Boards

IN ESSEX County there are 22 municipalities, of which 18 have municipal planning boards or committees. Of these 18 municipal boards 14 have recently completed or are in the process of preparing master plans for their municipalities. As each of these boards has studied its local problems, the bothersome fact has emerged in every instance that certain of our chief planning problems arise from causes wholly beyond local municipal control.

A few illustrations will make clear why this is so,—First—*As to highway traffic conditions in the suburbs.* About one-half of the population of Essex county lives in Newark and the other one-half in residential suburbs. Until recently, the policy of both the Federal and State Highway Departments was to construct great highways up to the boundary of our county and then let the streams of through traffic diffuse themselves through our town and village streets. The result of this policy has been that a constantly increasing volume of through motor traffic has used our suburban streets. Thus countless quiet neighborhoods have become busy traffic lanes and residential communities have been subjected to greatly increased expenses for traffic lights and traffic police,

to say nothing of the traffic delay at literally hundreds of intersections and the increased hazard to pedestrians and children. This has tended to depreciate suburban valuations and at the same time increase taxation.

Second—*As to traffic conditions in Newark.* While the suburbs have thus suffered from traffic diffusion the City of Newark, itself, as the focal point of motor traffic in the whole area, has suffered from traffic strangulation, resulting in a tremendous loss of time and delay in the movement not only of passenger vehicles and trucks but of buses and trolley cars. This condition, coupled with the lack of off-street parking facilities, has brought about serious deterioration both in business and residential values in the City of Newark with a resulting drastic loss in tax ratables.

Third—*Effect on tax burden.* As a direct result of the deterioration of tax values in the City of Newark, the tendency over a number of years has been to shift a portion of the county and state taxes from Newark to suburban communities which have been experiencing a steady increase in their local tax burden.

Each of these conditions, it should be noted, is entirely beyond local control. They each tend to emphasize the interdependence of the City of Newark and the suburban communities on each other. They point the need for a broad regional planning program based upon a recognition that the greater Newark area is a single entity that can prosper only if its traffic and transportation and land-use problems are studied and dealt with by one coordinated agency.

Thus it happens that the coming of this national convention of planning officials to Newark is very timely. It invites this great potential metropolis to take an inventory of itself.

From these stimulating papers, the outstanding impression I have received is that for the most effective planning mere political boundaries of municipalities and counties should be wholly disregarded. If planning is to be dynamic it must rest upon an *economic* foundation. In defining the area for which plans are to be made, artificial boundaries must be disregarded. A planning area is somewhat like a water shed. The boundaries of the area are lines marking the flow of trade, employment, daily business, social intercourse and newspaper circulation.

Certainly it seems that the time is now ripe in this North Jersey area for a broader planning study than any that has been recently made.

You will recall that fourteen municipal planning boards in Essex County have completed or are engaged in studies that relate to planning problems within their individual boundaries. The City of Newark has recently completed a most thorough and instructive analysis of its problems as the largest city in New Jersey. Having in mind, however, the manner in which time and space has been condensed by highway and aviation developments, I am wondering if a need does not exist for a modern planning study starting with Newark as the hub and including

the whole region that might be defined as the North Jersey Metropolitan Area.

Such a study, disregarding political boundaries and dealing with the great residential and industrial area around Newark, was included in the New York Regional Survey which was published 20 years ago. That study envisioned Newark as a great metropolitan center. It outlined the development of a magnificent civic center to be constructed between Broad Street and the Pennsylvania Station, which was then projected, with an impressive memorial plaza that would extend south to the present Federal Building. On the east of the Passaic River and as part of this great North Jersey metropolis it envisioned, in place of the unsightly Hackensack meadows, the possibility of extensive development of a Meadows City for industrial, maritime and residential purposes. As the result of the intervention of a world depression and a world war that vision and that scale of planning seems to have been almost forgotten.

There are, however, many signs that the time is ripe for a revival of such forward looking planning in this area. One striking indication of that is the intensive activity of our State Highway Department in progressing plans for two great arterial limited-access highways, one to be constructed as an East-West Freeway and the other as a North-South Parkway across Essex County.

Another far-reaching current development which may well stimulate our interest in the future of this area is the plan of the Port Authority for the great expansion of the Newark Airport and the Newark Marine Base. These developments should serve to awaken in Northern New Jersey a new regional consciousness. Such developments in our highways and in our Airport and Marine potentialities will make absolutely essential radical improvements in our facilities for rapid transit between points within the North Jersey Metropolitan Area. Such highway and transit improvements cannot fail to unify the area and stimulate its integration and growth.

There is today no single agency that is studying and planning for the coordination of these very far-reaching developments that are certain to change the whole character of the Newark Metropolitan Area for better or for worse. We in North Jersey are confronted by a regional planning opportunity that merits our most prompt and painstaking consideration.

Twenty-five years ago one of the authors of the New York Regional Survey described that plan as follows:

> It is a proposal to take the material and manmade foundations that we have and erect upon them the most splendid metropolis . . . the most magnificent regional community . . . the world has ever known.

Gentlemen, I leave with you the thought that this conference of the American Planning and Civic Association invites Metropolitan North Jersey to take an inventory of its whole regional problem.

County Parks and Parkways

GILMORE D. CLARKE, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, Washington, D. C.

I WANT to tell you a little of the history of the beginning of the first parkway, the Bronx River Parkway, a project which formed the pattern for the modern parkway and expressway, because I think it will be interesting to you to follow the chain of events which led up to the development of the several important systems of parkways and expressways in this country, more particularly those in the New York Metropolitan Region.

About forty years ago, Dr. William T. Hornaday, then the Director of the New York Zoological Park in the Borough of the Bronx, took a trip abroad with Mr. William White Niles, Vice President of the New York Zoological Society. At that time one of the perplexing problems which confronted those in charge of the zoo was the deplorable condition of the little Bronx River which modern civilization had turned into an open sewer from its source in middle Westchester County all the way down stream to its outlet into Long Island Sound. Water fowl were expected to live their lives along the banks of the River in the Zoo but the sewage killed many of them.

On the European trip, heretofore referred to, Messrs. Hornaday and Niles discussed this problem. They went directly to a small village near Inverness in Scotland, where Skibo Castle, the home of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, was situated. While Dr. Hornaday visited the Earl of Skibo, Mr. Niles walked through Inverness and along the banks of the little river which runs through the village; he tasted its waters, found them potable, and remarked later to Mr. Hornaday that if the good Scotch people could keep the streams running through their villages clean, then the City of New York could afford to do likewise. This experience was the forerunner of the Bronx River Parkway. Upon the return of Messrs. Hornaday and Niles to the United States they went together to Albany, called on the Governor, and told him that it would be worth while to acquire the land on both sides and for the full length of the Bronx River, for the purpose of eliminating all sources of pollution. Now the Zoo was a growing institution; in fact, it was then the third largest in the world.

As a result of this visit to Albany, a Bill creating the Bronx Parkway Commission was subsequently introduced in the Legislature and passed. The original Commission was composed of three commissioners, one from the Borough of Manhattan, one from the Borough of the Bronx, and one from Westchester County. The Bill provided that the City of New York should pay three-quarters of the cost of the land and of the improvements and the County of Westchester one-quarter. That was in 1906; in 1909, after some study, the first property was acquired for the Parkway.

In 1916 the Commissioners reviewed the situation and found that here was a potentially delightful little river valley which could be made available to many by constructing a driveway from Bronx Park, the southerly terminus, north for a distance of 15 miles to the Kensico Dam at Valhalla. The floor of the valley was, very naturally, below the grade of the intersecting streets of the communities through which it passed so it was decided to construct bridges to carry the intersecting traffic arteries over the parkway.

Construction started in 1916. The First World War intervened, and work was not renewed until 1919. The project, finished in 1923, became the first parkway of its kind ever built, and the legislation authorizing it was the first parkway legislation in the United States. The cost of the project will interest you, for in those days the figures were considered large. The entire project cost about fifteen million dollars for fifteen miles of parkway, or a million dollars a mile, and it was only with the greatest difficulty that that sum of money was made available through the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York and through the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County.

I remember the days when Mayor Hyland, whom we used to call "Red Mike," protested vigorougly against the use of New York City funds outside of the City limits. I can assure you that such a procedure will never again obtain; never again will City funds be spent for a project of this character outside of the limits of the City of New York.

The Bronx River Parkway was not supported by the public without a great deal of advertising through the Press and through many speeches to Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, and other groups. In fact, it did not receive public support until it was almost finished and the public could see what its value meant. The parkway drive is not designed on standards of today, for, when it was built, twenty-five miles an hour was a high rate of speed for motor cars. The curvature is not up to modern standards, although the drive is safe for travel at a speed up to thirty-five miles an hour. Practically all crossings at grade were eliminated by attractively designed bridges, both underpasses and overpasses. The first rigid frame bridge, erected over the Parkway at Bronxville, was the first of its kind in the world. Subsequently many have been build with a resultant saving of millions of dollars.

This parkway project interested the leaders in Westchester County who, at that time, had a very wise political boss. I introduce the subject of politics because it is an important factor; you cannot build roads without politicians, for they appropriate the necessary funds.

William L. Ward, Westchester's political boss in the twenties, was financially independent and his avocation was politics. He was a wise old gentleman and President of Birdsall & Ward Manufacturing Company, manufacturers of nuts and bolts. Having appraised the real value of this first parkway to the County, he told the County Officials

that Westchester must have a vast park system. This was immediately after the first World War. You will recall that our economic structure was somewhat different than it is now; people did not object to the spending money for well considered public improvements. As a result over eighty millions of dollars were appropriated by the County of Westchester to complete a park and parkway system, which consisted of the Hutchinson River Parkway, the Saw Mill River Parkway, the Bronx River Parkway, and the Cross County Parkway, among others, as well as a comprehensive system of county parks.

The standards of construction in those days, as I have already pointed out, were, very naturally, different. Many times subsequently we have wished that we had been wiser and, for example, had separated all of the parkway drives by a median dividing strip for traffic in opposite directions. We wished we had provided wider shoulders, wide enough for disabled cars to turn out along the sides of the drives; but we did not learn these things until later on.

The first legislation to provide for an interior corridor parkway, as we know it today, resulted in the Bronx River Parkway. It was enacted in 1906. The lands for this project were purchased for recreational purposes, and the width of the land-taking varied from a minimum of 300 to about 1500 or 1800 feet. I introduce this subject to indicate to you that we did not attempt to provide a uniform land-taking throughout the length of the project. We bought more land where land was cheap and less where it was expensive and we tried to provide a 300 foot minimum width. While the legislation permitted the construction of a driveway in the Bronx River Valley, it limited the use to passenger vehicles for the legal definition of a *parkway*, as recognized in the Courts of New York State, is "a strip of land dedicated to recreation, over which the abutting owners have no right of light, air, or access." That means that one may not drive trucks over a parkway; nor are buses allowed on it. While the legal definition of a parkway includes the phrase, "for recreational purposes," the parkway serves a larger purpose than recreation, for it is widely used by men and women who drive passenger cars in connection with their business and professional missions.

The Westchester County Parkway System is not the only development of its kind, for in another area of the New York Region, on Long Island, Commissioner Robert Moses has developed an important and notable system of parkways. This system is one part of the larger system of State Parks and Parkways in New York. The Southern Parkway, the Grand Central Parkway, and the Northern State Parkway are all elements in this system of parkways under the jurisdiction of the Long Island State Park Commission.

In 1934, when Mr. LaGuardia was elected Mayor of New York City, Mr. Moses sent a representative to see me who asked if I would accept the post as Consulting Landscape Architect to the New York City Park

Department. He said: "Mr. Moses is going to be the Park Commissioner for the entire City of New York." I said that the City Charter provided for five Commissioners, one for each Borough, and my visitor replied that a Bill to amend the City Charter had been introduced in the Legislature so as to provide for one Commissioner instead of five. The Legislature, a few days later, thereupon passed a bill amending the Charter, as I have described. I point out this incident to indicate to you how easy it is to obtain legislation! It was then that the outlying parkways in Westchester County and on Long Island, which formerly had their termini at the New York City line, were projected in and through the City. This new network of parkways within this City, begun in 1934, will be extended in anticipation of the need for a postwar construction program. Plans for new parkways and for the extension of existing ones throughout the metropolitan region are now in the process of preparation.

The outgrowth of the parkway has been the development of a motor artery known as the expressway; this type of artery embodies the same general principles of design that obtain in the case of the parkway. The *expressway* is sometimes called a *limited access highway*, a *thruway*, or a *freeway*, but all of these terms stand for the same type of facility.

An intolerable situation has come to pass in connection with our highways, with respect to abutting frontage rights. In approaching any American city today the highways are lined with billboards, gas stations, and hot dog stands, which seriously impede traffic on the road and destroy the character of the road borders. In the design of a four-lane highway, the road becomes effective for but two lanes because of the more or less unrestricted rights of abutting owners to front on the sides of the road. A highway for six lanes is effective for only four. The problem now before us deals with the insulation of the sides of the highway by protecting it against encroachments by private owners. It seems reasonable to believe that when a State, county, or other political subdivision spends large sums of money for a main artery of travel, it is uneconomical to provide the abutting owners of land with unlimited access to that road, particularly if they did not have access before. When a road is constructed upon an entirely new right-of-way and the abutting owners retain access rights, as obtains in the case of the highway, they are getting something which their neighbors one block or more removed cannot have. It would seem reasonable, therefore, when a highway department purchases new rights-of-way, that they should be acquired on the principle of an expressway, thus to prevent any one from having direct access to the sides of the road. We are well along toward a point in motorway development so that practically all main arteries may with profit be designed on the expressway principle. I do not see any good reason why all States cannot have adequate enabling expressway legislation which, incidentally, will eliminate the billboard and other nuisances that obtain now alongside of our highways.

Now let us consider the reasons, other than the purely practical, for changing the general character of our highways. I do not believe that any one of you will doubt that a motorway, on which no one is allowed to front or to have access or ingress, is more efficient than the ordinary type of highway we have been accustomed to build. It is like building a railroad; no one fronts on a railroad track. There are other reasons besides the practical; they are reasons which, for want of a better term, we may call the aesthetic factors. We are all interested, I am sure, in introducing the element of beauty into the building of a road, just as the public, riding over a public highway, ponder unconsciously over the more or less intangible factors, factors which have been introduced into the design and the construction of the parkways I have described, through studied alignment, through border protection, through planting, through bridges that harmonize with the landscape, and through details such as light poles, guard rails, etc.; all of these elements go to make the whole project beautiful. State Highway Departments must become interested in beauty from now on. Engineers do not like to use the term, *beauty*, they consider it an effeminate term, but nevertheless it is an element which must be introduced into all motorway projects we build if for no other reason than that the people are going to demand it. The public in this New York Region has got a taste of what it means to drive over attractive parkways and they will not much longer tolerate the ugly hot dog stands, the billboards, and the gas stations that line most of our highways. The element of beauty, therefore, must be introduced; it is the element of design which makes our highways, our expressways, and our parkways worth while as parts of the world we live in. Every element which is introduced into the design of the parkway or the expressway, which aids in making them more attractive, aids, at the same time, in making them more efficient, more useful, more safe.

In closing I quote from a recent address by the Honorable Robert Moses:

> Thirty miles an hour on the average boulevard is plenty in cities, forty is enough in the suburbs, and fifty should be tops anywhere in the country, no matter how open and thinly populated. My idea of futility is to build a beautiful parkway for speed demons who can't tell a flowering shrub from a bale of hay. I do not believe that any manufacturer should be allowed to advertise that he makes cars which will run eighty miles an hour. I speak as an official who for years has had to look at daily records of gruesome accidents, and as one who knows that no improvement in the making of cars and roads, no center curbs, no training, no regulations, and no police supervision can make high speed even comparatively safe. Fast driving should be stopped at the source—that is, in the factory.

Metropolitan Transportation Planning

AUSTIN J. TOBIN, Executive Director, The Port of New York Authority, New York, N. Y.

TO PLAN for the modern urban community is necessarily to plan for transportation, for the modern metropolis, its transportation problems, and its transportation resources and the impact of those resources on its over-all municipal requirements, are inseparably bound together.

Indeed, the great cities that we know today, with but few exceptions, can trace their genesis to the facts of transportation. The story is told that a fundamentalist preacher once attempted to demonstate the existence of Divine Providence by pointing out that the finest harbors in the world had been placed at the door of all of the world's greatest cities. A more widely held thesis today is that the great modern city is born and develops out of what is called the *transportation break*, or the need for a transportation interchange.

We find everywhere clear illustrations of this thesis. The foundation of our urban economy and prosperity here in this great metropolitan district of northern New Jersey and New York is transportation. Our position as a crossroads of the world's transportation rests entirely upon the geographical fact of the Port of New York. In the last analysis, some 13½ million of us are crowded within the metropolitan area of New York and Northern New Jersey because, when the world was fashioned, there was scooped out in this particular location on the coastline of the world's busiest ocean, a great natural harbor. From that harbor two mighty water courses—Long Island Sound, and the Hudson River—afforded the Colonists the easiest and safest routes of travel both to New England and to the great inland territories to the West. Down through New England the Connecticut flowed into the Sound; down through New York the Mohawk flowed into the Hudson. So down to the sea came the raw goods of the New World; so up from the sea flowed the goods from the Old World that were so essential to the building of the New.

So too Chicago developed where transportation facilities serving the Atlantic Coastal Plain, the Great Lakes Basin and the Mississippi Valley could be interchanged with a minimum of topographic obstacles. The great midwestern metropolis, as we know it today, developed its principal economic functions in servicing the interchange of the railroad routes to the West, to the South, and to the East.

Moreover, to live its own life the city is wholly dependent for its sustenance on the transportation facilities which it serves and which in turn serve it. The people living in the city must feed on the agricultural

hinterland. When transportation was slow and facilities were meager the natural phenomenon of food spoilage in transit severely limited the radius of hinterland on which the urban community could depend. Faster and more dependable transport extended that radius steadily. The number of people it was physically possible to support in an urban way of life grew correspondingly greater. Today, with fast refrigerated transportation it is possible for New York to live on fresh food produced in areas as far distant as California, Florida and the Gulf Coast; in other words, the food hinterland of New York City is at least as great as the entire United States. Food transportation under normal circumstances is no longer a limiting factor on urban population.

Not only in its external relations but in its internal functioning the city depends for its livelihood and its amenities on its transportation facilities. And, as I shall presently indicate, the problems which have resulted from the development of modern urban transportation, are at the root of today's great dilemma of the American City.

Perhaps the most basic feature distinguishing urban from rural life is the separation of work and home. The city dweller must travel to work. There was once a time when the journey to work was relatively short, when business establishments were relatively small and employees walked to work because no means of mass transportation was available. Then came, one after the other, the horse-drawn omnibus, the horse-drawn streetcar, the electric streetcar, the elevated railway, the subway, the motor car and the motor bus. Each of these advances in transport made possible a lengthening of the tolerable distance from home to work. Cities no longer needed to be over-congested masses of workmen's homes *on the other side of the tracks*. Workers responded to the new conditions by moving their homes to more open territory and employers moved their business locations to take maximum advantage of the new transportation facilities. The home-to-work journey became longer and longer. Today, there are millions of people in this metropolitan region whose homes are separated from their places of employment by ten miles or more.

The modern city, therefore, owes its basic existence, its possibility of growth and physical character—as well as its engulfing problems—to the factors of transportation.

Let us review by way of example, a few facts regarding passenger transportation in the New York metropolitan region today.

Our best estimate of the number of people entering the southern half of Manhattan Island on a typical business day is 3,500,000 or more. About half of those entering the city's principal employment center come from the east, from Brooklyn, Queens, and the suburban counties of Long Island. Another 40 percent arrive from a northerly direction, including those who live in Northern New Jersey and who cross the Hudson River by the George Washington Bridge and ferries north of

59th Street. Those coming across the Hudson River from New Jersey account for about nine percent of the total and those coming from Staten Island about one percent.

This total movement taxes to the utmost the facilities available for passenger transportation in the region. The rapid transit load is particularly great, accommodating as it does almost 66 percent of all these daily travelers. About 29 percent come by motor vehicles, which includes, of course, motor buses. Railroad commuters account for about five percent.

The demands of this fluid type of population, which is repeated to varying extents over the other large urban areas, have strained every municipal service, its highways, utilities, transit systems, schools and the requirements for fire protection and policing. Most of the cities of the country are chasing the mechanical rabbit of runaway municipal demands and leaping costs, and they are running on the tired old legs of municipal revenue sources that have not basically changed for the past 100 years. Though 3½ millions come into Manhattan to work every day, that Borough itself lost about half a million residents, or 20 percent of its entire population, between 1910 and 1930, and though it recovered a bit by 1940, the recently published population estimates of the Consolidated Edison Company indicate that Manhattan has been losing ground again since that time. While the municipalities must therefore follow the crowds to the outer rim of their municipal boundaries, they must also—not only for those crowds, but for the crowds that pass beyond the boundaries and out of the taxing jurisdiction of the cities into the suburban communities—repair and reconstruct and adjust the central core of the city to keep up with the demands of traffic and business and the increasing requirements of governmental services.

The urgent need for new and essential municipal facilities is staggering both in its proportions, and in the hard fact that our cities cannot go on functioning without these new and immense capital requirements. For instance, the capital budget of the City of New York for 1948 is in the neighborhood of a quarter of a billion dollars. That City's capital program over the next five years amounts to 600 million dollars, and that is really a modest estimate of what the people of that City must have to fulfill their barest capital requirements for essential municipal construction over the next five years.

Obsolescence is becoming worse with each succeeding year, and the cities must have more and more money to keep the existing inadequate plants in operation. Yet the funds are simply not available from the established sources of municipal revenue. This is the dilemma of the American city. It is largely the consequence of the improvements in urban transportation throughout the past half century.

I believe that it is inevitable that the sources of necessity will find the new sources of revenue which are essential to meet this problem. I be-

lieve also that they will reapportion the functions of States, counties, the cities themselves, and metropolitan authorities, to help carry the load. For not only new sources of revenue but new techniques of government will be required to assure the construction of the prodigious amount of public facilities which the people of our cities must have.

It does seem to me, however, that the problem for civic planning is rather that of finding these new sources and exploring these new techniques for the reshuffling of municipal functions, before we plan for increased load factors and the more rapid movement of urban transportation. It is time, in other words, that we stopped and took a breath, in order that there may be some hope of having our municipal services catch up with the centrifugal pace of urban transportation. For the first is the prerequisite of the second and the municipalities of the country are headed for financial smash-ups if they don't concentrate on making the tremendous financial adjustments in their sources of revenue that are required for the American city today, and also on the reapportionment of functions that are required to carry the governmental load of ever-expanding municipal requirements.

Furthermore, the urban transit problem of today is that of improving the safety, the comfort and convenience of the transportation systems which we now have, rather than thinking in terms of their expansion. The emphasis should be rather on the problem of improving the terminal operations of our urban transportation systems than on the line haul.

For many, many years The Port of New York Authority has been studying the problem of urban transportation in the New Jersey-New York metropolitan area, including the possibilities of building a rail tunnel to link up New Jersey steam and electric operations with midtown Manhattan. Studies made before the War indicated that the capital cost of such a system would be 187 million dollars and *that it* would show an annual deficit of as much as 5 million *dollars a year.* Under today's construction costs these prices would be more than double. In cooperation with the Governor of New Jersey, we are, however, making studies of a new transit connection which would make further improvements in terminal service for those rail passengers who still have to depend upon ferries. This proposal would link the Central Railroad of New Jersey, whose passengers have no Manhattan access except by ferry from Jersey City, with existing Pennsylvania Railroad electric service into downtown Manhattan, and with a north-south connection in Hudson County to Susquehanna Transfer, where the passengers could take advantage of the bus service into the new Union Bus Terminal which will be completed in 1950 in midtown Manhattan. Such a terminal line would also serve to link up Newark Airport and the industries on the Kearny Peninsula with Hudson County and Manhattan.

Our planning for urban transportation in the Port Authority has been largely based on the belief that the provision of terminal facilities for

all forms of transportation is a problem of equal importance with that of providing the *line haul* transportation medium itself. Indeed, it is the terminal which stands at the focal point of the city's economic role of servicing a transportation interchange.

Inadequacy of terminal facilities characterizes most large cities today. And I include in my consideration marine terminals, railroad passenger and freight terminals, air terminals, truck terminals, motor bus terminals and that most vexing of all terminal problems, the provision of parking space for the individual motor car.

Many of the apparent bottlenecks in transportation facilities are really problems of terminal capacity. Our trunk line and suburban line railroads entering New York and Northern New Jersey are pushed hard, it is true, by the loads they carry, but their principal problems revolve around the capacities of their terminals. The motor truck, the bus and the private automobile that stand in city streets because no proper terminal facilities are available for them, create the major part of the street traffic problem. Even the newest form of transportation, the airplane, presents its major problem today in connection with the capacity of its ground facilities rather than the capacity of the airways themselves.

The vital importance of terminal facilities as the key to the problem of urban transportation is apparent immediately to the city planner by a mere consideration of some of the statistics of movement of food and freight into and through the Port of New York. Every day, on the average, 10,000 tons of fresh fruits and vegetables come into New York City, by rail, by motor truck and some by ship. The movement of milk accounts for 9,000 tons daily, and meat 3,000 tons. While I have not the data that would indicate the daily movement into the City of canned goods and other packaged and prepared foods, it is apparent, from the fact that about 1,600 pounds of food are consumed per person per day in the metropolitan area, that the transportation of this supply and the problem of its distribution through the area, is prodigious. For it means that about ten million tons of food are consumed each year in the metropolitan area, practically all of which must be hauled in from outside by rail, truck and vessel. From the standpoint of planning the operations of transportation in the port area it is obvious from these figures that the problem is almost entirely one of terminal handling.

The terminal problem as the fulcrum of urban transportation is obvious too when we consider the functions of this area as a port of entry or exit, as a gateway between New England and the South, and in its general operation as a transportation interchange.

There are eight trunkline railroads that serve the Port of New York. In 1946 they handled 112 million tons, of which about 26 million were hauled through the port as a trans-shipment gateway and 86 million tons were shipped into or out of the port as a consuming, manufacturing

and distributing center. Of the 26 million tons which were shipped through the port as a gateway in 1946, about half the volume consisted of interchange between Southern and New England railroads and the other half were trans-shipments between railroads and deep-sea vessels in foreign and coastwise trade. Of the 86 million tons of freight hauled into and out of the port, about 35 million tons were coal for conversion to light, heat and power, for industrial, commercial and household heating; about 7 million tons consisted of perishable and non-perishable foods for consumption in the area and 44 million tons of merchandise for consumption or for processing and shipment out of the area.

In addition to this tremendous interchange of railroad freight, over-the-road trucks haul into and out of the port area about 25 million tons of freight annually.

That the problem of urban transportation for us, as for most large cities, is therefore the problem of the construction of terminals for railroads, trucks, buses, ships and planes is apparent upon the mere recital of the foregoing figures.

This was recognized by the forward-looking citizens who created the Port Authority twenty-seven years ago, as the joint agency of the States of New York and New Jersey for the development of the public terminal and transportation facilities of the metropolitan area of Northern New Jersey and New York. Throughout their Treaty the two States emphasized the essential necessity of modern, efficient and continuing terminal construction to maintain the position of this Port District as the crossroads of the world's transportation—land, sea and air. Their definition in that Treaty of the terminal developments to which they directed the work and attention of the Port Authority, was as broad as it was possible to write it. The Port Authority was directed to include in its terminal program "every kind of terminal *** facility now in use or hereafter designed for use for the handling, storage, loading or unloading of freight and steamship, railroad or freight terminals." And we were even directed, with amazing prescience when you consider that the Treaty was written almost thirty years ago, to provide facilities for the handling of aircraft.

That the terminal problem was seen as the core of the transportation problem in this metropolitan area is indicated by the language of the Treaty that "a better coordination of the terminal *** facilities *** in the Port of New York will result in great economies, benefiting the Nation, as well as the States of New York and New Jersey." And in the Treaty recital that "the future development of such terminal *** facilities*** will require the expenditure of large sums of money and the cordial cooperation of the States of New York and New Jersey in the encouragement of the investment of capital and in the formulation and execution of the necessary physical plans."

Accordingly, the Port Authority has been planning, developing,

constructing and operating a comprehensive system of metropolitan terminals for the handling of passengers and freight.

The Port Authority's new *Union Motor Bus Terminal*, to be constructed on the west side of Manhattan, at Eighth Avenue and 40th Street, will accommodate 7,500 bus arrivals and departures a day. It is estimated that in the course of a day 200,000 bus passengers will have been served by the new terminal. From a community planning point of view, one of the most important services that the new terminal will perform will be the removal from the streets of practically all the buses connecting the center of the City with its western environs. The terminal will include direct ramp access to the Manhattan portal of the Lincoln Tunnel. It is our view that the removal of the vehicles from the streets is a more effective aid in ameliorating traffic congestion than is that of attempting to provide ever more and more street facilities.

Similarly, the necessity of developing union off-street terminals for our over-the-road motor trucks is recognized by the Port Authority in the construction now under way of two of the largest union motor truck terminals in the country, one in Manhattan in the vicinity of the Holland Tunnel, and one in Newark just north of the Airport. At both of these terminals, over-the-road trucks will be loaded and unloaded and the cargoes they take out over the highways or bring in to these congested urban areas, will be picked up or distributed from the terminals by a fleet of *mosquito trucks* each of which will be assigned to serve a specifically designed area in the city, much like the rounds of the postman. The amount of actual truck travel mileage saved in the distribution of freight should be extremely effective in relieving the traffic load on congested city streets.

This is much the same function for the over-the-road trucks that the railroads enjoy at the Port Authority Union Railroad Terminal on Manhattan Island, for the handling of less-than-carload railroad freight.

In the air age our cities have been coming to grips with the problem of providing terminal facilities for the passengers and freight of a medium of travel that is rapidly reducing the furtherest reaches of the globe to a "short-haul" service. In 1947 between 3½ and 4 million scheduled airline passengers entered or left the Port of New York District. Overseas passengers handled at LaGuardia Airport increased in the short space of a year and a half from 3,000 a month to 40,000 last September. By 1955 we estimate that 11,230,000 air passengers a year will move throught the three terminal airports of this metropolitan district, and by 1950 we expect 21,375,000 passengers to require this terminal service.

Over the next ten years the Port Authority will go forward with a program of metropolitan airport construction to meet this new urban requirement at an estimated cost of over 250 million dollars. We believe that this investment in our newest form of terminals can, like the investment in all other Port Authority projects, be placed upon a self-

supporting basis and that its development, as is the case of the development of all other Port Authority facilities, can go forward without further burden to the general taxpayers. On this very timely phase of the problem of urban transportation I would like to quote the Chairman of the Port Authority, the Hon. Howard S. Cullman, who said in a talk that he made last week before the Aviation Writer's Association:

> I submit this principle—that airports must be self-supporting—is related to the whole future of air transportation. There are between 15 and 20 major air centers in the United States where commercial traffic within a few years will require greater capacity than the average three-runway airport. There is little construction going on right now to meet this demand. It is a fact that present airline airports are not keeping step with the spectacular development of airplane and air service. It is obvious that financial difficulties and the demand for municipal needs of higher priority, have dampened the enthusiasm of States and municipalities for airport development and operation. Federal airport aid can meet only a small fraction of airport needs. Self-supporting airports are therefore essential if the air transport industry is to realize its great future. Unless we can blaze the trail here in New York, there would seem to be little hope of doing it elsewhere.

In the field of waterfront terminals, the Port Authority is now in the process of developing the facilities at Port Newark under a fifty-year lease agreement with this City. We operate and have recently modernized a Grain Terminal and piers on Cowanus Bay in Brooklyn. We have submitted a very carefully thought-out plan for the development of modern piers and terminal facilities to be located on the New Jersey shore of the Hudson River at Hoboken. Our proposal to go forward with the construction and operation of that proposed $16,000,000 facility is now before the officials of that City. Within the past few months also we have completed an extensive survey of the New York City waterfront and have proposed a $114,000,000 construction program for the development of the piers and marine terminal facilities of that tremendous easterly shore of the Port of New York along which, and out of which, that great City grew.

Most of the piers in New York Harbor were built long before the day of the motor truck. At the present time a very large proportion of all of the cargoes handled over waterfront facilities arrive or depart by truck. The piers, however, are entirely too narrow to accommodate modern vehicles and the consequence is that much of the loading and unloading which should take place on the pier is forced to take place on the streets that border the waterfront. The streets themselves thereupon are fatally handicapped in carrying out their intended role of traffic ways, and congestion. Delay and high costs are the inevitable consequence.

I have chosen to discuss the problem of urban transportation from what might be characterized as an introspective viewpoint because I think that our cities have a much more grievous concern in meeting the problems that have followed in the wake of a fluid population than they have with the achievement of any greater fluidity. And I believe that the comprehensive planning of our urban terminals for the handling of

freight and passengers is the foundation of metropolitan transportation planning.

Following hard upon the magnificent highways which are being pushed forward by such engineers as my old friend Mr. Noble, and following hard upon the efficient mass transportation of our urban populations which will be described by Mr. Merrill, is the fundamental problem of the American City in the years ahead of us.

The first aspect of that problem is how the American City can continue to meet the cost of complete reconstruction of its whole municipal plan which is essential to meet the needs of a population that has expanded to the city's perimeters and beyond. The second aspect of the problem is the reconstruction of the core of the old city and the construction of terminals to take care of the daytime surge of population and of goods.

A student of municipal finance, Mabel L. Walker, recently said in an address delivered before the Municipal Finance Officers' Association in New York on May 26, 1947:

> During the transitional years it will be far more expensive because these old cities of ours have got to be loosened up at their stiff old joints and elasticized in their hardened old arteries, and that is probably going to be a more costly process than building them in the first place.

Highway Planning in Metropolitan Areas

CHARLES M. NOBLE, State Highway Engineer, New Jersey State Highway Department, Trenton, N. J.

WHAT do we mean by planning? Is it merely an artistically prepared drawing, about which there is a great deal of high-minded discussion, put on public display for a short time and then relegated to the files of yesteryear to gather dust? Or is it a living vibrant force, conceived and dedicated to the purpose of promoting industrial and commercial health, improving the lot of the individual and making this land of ours a place for better living?

The answer depends on intelligent conception, sincerity of purpose and the aggressive resolve of public officials, business and civic leaders and the whole people to put it to work for the accomplishment of the goal of a better and more prosperous society. Planning is worthless without action. The plan of itself will accomplish noth'ng. People, only people, can make the plan work.

What is the objective? What are we trying to accomplish? Briefly, the objective is to arrange and fit the physical plant of modern civilization into the spiritual and constructive desires of men so as to achieve security, enjoyment and satisfaction of life for all.

This is not simple in the highly complex scientific-mechanical civilization in which we live. And the most complex and critical part of the problem lies in city and metropolitan areas.

Before we start to plan we must understand the problem. We must recognize the forces that are at work and what makes city and metropolitan life tick. In order to live a city must perform a service to its people and the economy of the region, State and Nation. It is a Service Force. In order to plan the city, the planner must know its mission; what services it must render to the people and the economy to justify its existence.

In the genesis of civilization when man crept out of his cave, the germ of the city was formed when families of like blood, thought and objectives drew together for mutual protection from savage roving bands bent on pillage and destruction. The city was the citadel. The tiller of the soil, the herdsman, went out by day to tend the fields and flocks and returned by night to the protection of the city where he could oppose the enemy, not alone and helpless, but behind the city wall in company with his brothers. It was but natural that men should gravitate to this gathering place to trade and exchange the products of the field. Here was a convenient, safe market place. Trade and commerce became a part of organized society. Thus the city was born and great cities grew and flourished when located along the avenues and crossroads of transportation routes. For thousands of years cities developed on these principles. Soon arts and crafts developed on a more organized basis, the age of specialization began and the city was the mart at which the products of the countryside were exchanged for the productions of the city dwelling guildsman and artisan. It was inevitable that mechanical devices would be developed by the inventive brain of man to lessen the fatigue of human effort and increase the productiveness of the individual thus improving the economic status of the producer.

With the advent of the railway, which substituted mechanical motive power for animal power, began the real industrial, agricultural, commercial and community development of America. The city, the community, became the hub of this development. It became possible to gather the products of the mine, the forest, the soil from a great distance and deliver them rapidly with economy to the community where labor was available for further processing into finished products. Thus industry and commerce gravitated to the city where raw materials and labor met. The commercial and industrial development of the Nation took place along the railway lines of America and the economy of the Nation revolved around rail and water transportation.

At the turn of the twentieth century settlement of the United States was virtually complete and the rail and waterway system very nearly stabilized as to location. Industry was settled in communities where labor was available and where raw materials could be delivered eco-

nomically by rail or water. But commerce and retail trade were confined to areas within *walking* or *horse and buggy distance* of the customer and worker. The range of the farmer's market was confined to a half day's journey by team and wagon. This period at the turn of the century represented the culmination of the horse and buggy-railway economy. It was geared to the fixed rails of the iron horse.

Suddenly, about one moment ago on the scale of human history, the revolution of the automotive vehicle burst upon the world and a vista of more rapid free wheel transportation began to unfold. It has taken forty-eight years for the human mind to adjust itself to this revolution and begin to grasp the tremendous significance of the automotive vehicle and the highway transportation system to economic, industrial and community life. The automotive vehicle injected an entirely new principle into transportation flexibility. In addition, the increased speed, size and weight of the vehicle has forced a new concept of the physical and geometric characteristics of the highway structure and compelled a utilization of the laws of motion in its design as well as a recognition of human psychology and behavior.

The first twenty years of the century were devoted to perfecting the mechanical design of the vehicle so it would be dependable and economical to operate; and to developing efficient manufacturing processes in order that its selling price would place it within reach of the average American citizen. During this period few people really recognized the potentialities of the motor car or anticipated the revolution it would cause in American economy, culture and social values.

After the close of World War I the automotive era began in earnest and within the period between the two wars a highway construction program in the United States was accomplished without parallel in the history of the world. This program, in the short span of twenty years, provided a network of all-weather highways from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Canadian border to Mexico. Without this system the automotive era would have withered and died and great industries would be unborn.

But the greater part of this highway development was in the rural areas to make such areas accessible to the city. Little was done to adjust the horse-and-buggy street system in the city to the changed requirements of the automotive era. Now realization has come that the economy brought about by the automotive revolution is bogging down in urban areas and a shift in emphasis in highway planning is necessary in order to bring the economy of the Nation back into healthful balance. Therefore highway planning in metropolitan areas assumes national as well as local, regional and state interest.

The city, and in no less degree the metropolitan area, is a living and breathing organism. As in every living organism, the cells must be renewed when they wither and die. The physical and administrative plant

of the city must be constantly adjusted and renewed in order to meet the impact of changing conditions; otherwise the city as a whole will die.

But to plan renewal so as ever and continuously to strengthen and expand city prosperity requires the establishment of the fundamental mission of each city and its component parts. This applies in even greater force to metropolitan areas. The mission of each city and area will depend on physical resources, present development, markets, land forms, subsurface conditions and present and potential transportation facilities. The mission may be simple or it may be complex. It may be a residential area with simple maintenance-of-life shopping facilities. It may be a transportation center with minimum residential, shopping and commercial plant to serve the basic mission. (The transportation center may involve only one of the great mechanical transportation forms: rail, water, air and highway, or two, or all in combination.) The city may be an industrial area. It may be a residential, shopping, commercial and industrial city. Or it may be a combination of all of these and such a combination is needed to produce a great city and generate a metropolitan area. The mission must be in accord with the suitability of the area to successfully meet the requirements of people, commerce and industry.

Today, many cities are sick with the creeping paralysis of high taxes, street-traffic congestion, inadequate, slow and congested mass transit, obsolescence, inefficient merchandizing and an antiquated municipal-government administrative mechanism. People, commerce and industry are moving out of such cities because of high taxes, desire for open spaces, more light and air, crime incidence, obsolescence, accident hazard and traffic congestion. This flight causes loss in tax ratables. In the past 20 years tax ratables lost by Boston total $248,000,000, Trenton $54,000,000 (26 percent), Newark $96,000,000 (12 percent) and Jersey City $233,000,000,(38 percent). As long as there is cheap, undeveloped land on the outskirts at low tax rates, obsolescence, high taxes, and traffic congestion will drive dwellers, commerce and industry outward away from the center as surely as centrifugal motion drives particles outward. As ratables are lost, the tax rate rises, more ratables are lost, again the tax rate rises. This vicious cycle will continue to bankruptcy unless something is done about it and something must be done about it, for it is unthinkable that the tremendous public investment in schools, streets, sewers, treatment plants, water works, distribution systems, buildings, parks, playgrounds and the private investment in buildings, churches, utilities, railways, plants and fixtures should be wasted.

This will not happen, for Americans are resourceful people. But an entirely new approach is needed to meet the challenge of the automotive age. There must be a new conception of land use so it will be more efficient and can support present high governmental costs; im-

proved administration, more equitable tax structure so the property owner and industry do not carry the entire load; and a solution of the traffic congestion problem. The advantage of living and doing business in the city must be restored. The city must be *resold* to the *customer; i.e.* the dweller, the businessman and the industrialist.

To be successfully *sold*, the city must provide:

(a) free flowing, adequate and rapid transportation
(b) open spaces, light and air
(c) segregation of business, industry and housing
(d) attractiveness
(e) elimination of slums and sub-standard housing
(f) economical cost to the dweller, businessman and industrialist; in a word the "customer"
(g) greenbelts, parks, recreation areas, vehicular parking areas
(h) freedom from street traffic congestion
(i) safety
(j) freedom from crime
(k) adequate terminals

It has been said that transportation of persons can never catch up with requirements as long as buildings continue to be built up in the air. This is true if every square foot of the city as laid out for the horse-and-buggy era is now utilized in the automotive era for the purpose of buildings alone. There must be a balance between land use and land service.

It is recognized that transportation, both individual and mass, would be improved if the dweller could live within walking distance of his work and minimum maintenance-of-life shopping facilities. The multiple dwelling unit located close to but shielded from industrial and business offers many advantages. Maintenance-of-life shops could be located in the basement thus providing all weather and close access. Playground, recreation, laundry, garaging and parking facilities should be on the premises. In this way greenbelts, light and air can be had in even the most thickly populated and industrialized areas. And only in this way can more service at less tax rate per capita, but with increased tax return to the municipality, be achieved.

If the city is to be saved these things must be done. It is useless to plan and construct expensive free flowing traffic arteries to help save the cities if they are going to die anyway. The urban planning is now. The execution is a long-term project which may require a century in fulfillment but unless there is a plan and imaginative, energetic men to execute it, the way of the city will be hard.

Intolerable traffic and parking congestion is the immediate and critical emergency facing urban and metropolitan areas today. The paralysis caused by a deficiency in vital vehicular traffic facilities is strangling the life out of our highly complex and thickly developed areas. Free flowing traffic arteries and parking facilities are the life lines desperately needed to sustain urban life until complete rescue can be

effected by long range planning geared to the automotive age. But these life lines must be carefully and scientifically planned, utilizing recently developed modern highway planning techniques, and the plan must be coordinated to fit into the over-all regional and city plan.

What kind of highway transportation system is required to bring to fruition the more abundant life so desired by the urban population? What kind of system and types of highways are required to exploit fully and advance the prosperity and welfare of the State and the community? What system is required to expand and stabilize industry and commerce?

The system must be well planned, it must be comprehensive, it must be coordinated, it must be located along the *desire lines* of the traffic, it must be flexible and it must provide the character of service required by automotive age traffic in every situation.

The highway of today and tomorrow must be of a type, location and design that will eliminate delay and congestion, relieve the driver of nerve strain and tension and be free from accident potential. Each highway should be in the location and of the type and design best suited to serve the particular traffic needs of the area and community.

To understand the problem more clearly it is necessary to outline the general groups into which highways fall and the kind of service each renders. In broad terms, the highway transportation system is composed of three general groups: (1) The feeder system, (2) The ordinary county and state highway system, (3) The freeway and parkway system.

The feeder system consists of those roads that primarily serve the land directly and which collect and diffuse traffic. These are land service roads. The group includes urban streets which provide access to property and which do not serve as through traffic arteries. This system is of the greatest importance for it makes the land accessible for use. Without accessibility land is worthless as witness the millions of acres of undeveloped fertile and productive land in various parts of the world which is entirely idle because transportation is not accessible.

The ordinary county and state highway system collects traffic from the feeders and carries the great burden of traffic between centers of population. It is a town-to-town system. In addition it serves the land along its borders since free access is permitted adjacent land owners. Such highways are not entirely local, they are of statewide significance and in fact many of them are of national import.

The freeway and parkway system consists of controlled access highways and it serves as the relief valve for congestion. These highways do not serve the land directly since free access to them is denied abutting property owners except at specially designed traffic interchange facilities. The justification for them is brought about by intolerable congestion and delay on land service highways. High traffic density coupled with

costly and nerve-racking delays occasioned by red lights, intersections at grade, left turns and disturbances caused by vehicles entering and leaving the highway at will between intersections to patronize roadside establishments, greatly reduces freedom of movement and increases accidents. The most pressing application of the freeway and parkway principle is in highly developed and industrialized metropolitan areas where traffic congestion is strangling further development.

The detrimental effect on the economic life of the countrywide, the community and the individual caused by inadequate type, poorly located highways is so pronounced that every precaution should be taken to assure proper type selection and location. Therefore highway planning occupies a preeminent position today in highway affairs. This is in contrast to the situation twenty years ago.

Early in the development of the motor age, highway planning was comparatively simple, for the need to connect centers of population with passable roads through rural areas was obvious, and instinctive engineering judgment was adequate to meet and promote the development of the motor car. But as motor transport integrated itself into American life and industry, the problem became more complex until today the instinctive approach will no longer suffice and more analytical methods are required in order that the highway transportation system will pace the tempo of industrial and social development.

Modern highway planning utilizes the scientific techniques developed over the past dozen years by the highway planning surveys initiated by the Public Roads Administration. These techniques include existing traffic patterns, existing and future volumes, existing road capacity, origin and destination and desire lines of traffic, benefit-cost ratio, population growth and trends, vehicle registration and trends, land use, mass transit, other forms of transportation and terminals, concentration of population, shopping and employment, recreation areas and location, growth and trends of commerce and industry. It is also necessary to integrate the development plans of national, state and local planning agencies into the highway net. It is necessary to learn the long range trend of industrial and agricultural development, to ascertain where water power and water supply reservoirs, airfields, canals, railways, terminals, recreation areas, state and national forests and military installations are planned in order that the highway system will serve these facilities effectively and not conflict with them. It is also essential to coordinate and cooperate with local planning bodies so there will be complete coordination through all levels of government.

The New Jersey State Highway Department has recognized the importance of adequate and skillful planning and has organized a Division of Planning and Economics. This division is headed by a Director and Deputy and is composed of two principal bureaus: (1) The Bureau of Planning and Economics, (2) The Bureau of Planning Survey.

The latter bureau gathers highway planning (traffic) data in the field and collates it, and the former analyzes the information, applying it to practical highway planning problems having due regard for the principles of economics. This agency can determine how many traffic lanes are required in each traffic shed to serve present and future needs, what type of facility is needed, the general course of its location, location and capacity of terminal and parking areas, location and general design of traffic interchange facilities to effectively serve the area and at the same time avoid flooding the existing street system with more traffic load than it can effectively carry. All of these things can be effectively planned so the highway transportation system will be integrated into and coordinated with overall metropolitan long-range planning to accomplish the mission of the area and revitalize it for better living, greater security and economic stability. All these things it can plan but planning is worthless without constructive and intelligent execution. The planning agency is set up, the execution is another matter.

These principles are recognized generally and nationally. But unfortunately urban planning today is served only by lip service in many places. As long as the plan is confined to a scrap of paper, all is accord and a hum of praise is in the air. As soon, however, as the plan is put to work and someone is hurt by the operation, the sound of discord is heard. Opposition is quickly and skillfully organized by affected minorities determined to block the improvement, save their homes and businesses and prevent the immediate loss in tax ratables destroyed to make way for the improvement. One hears often the words *Chinese Wall* spoken by persons little realizing the original Chinese Wall was built in desperation as a bulwark of protection and that the Chinese Wall of their imaginations already exists in declining ratables, flight of dwellers, commerce and industry due to lack of planning, obsolescence, improper land use, traffic congestion and because their town offers less than the competitor's. Among the general public, proponents of a project which involves a sacrifice and a physical loss to the city are seldom on hand to champion the undertaking and combat opponents. In fact the public is confused by charges and counter charges and does not know where its interest lies.

The man in the street can easily visualize and will admit readily that cross traffic on *at grade* intersections is the principal bar to free and expeditious traffic flow. The red light is the modern symbol of lack of progress. It is the dream of every motorist to drive on a highway without red lights and cross traffic from beginning to end. The motorist wants to avoid the red-light district. But when the motorist and man in the street is transformed into an individual home or business owner and applies his thinking to a specific plan or project which has reached the construction stage, he loses perspective and does not see why he

should make a personal sacrifice to promote the public welfare. This is particularly true on highway projects in built-up areas where it is proposed to separate cross-traffic grades in order to provide a free-flowing artery.

This sad state of affairs is largely our fault. The public has not been informed properly of the ultimate over-all objectives and how a particular project fits into the over-all plan to make the city a better place in which to live and work, increase its prosperity and stabilize values. We must take our story to the public, not expect it to come to us or to attend dreary meetings in a drafty hall. Public relations may be an over-worked phrase but it is needed in urban and metropolitan planning.

Progress and genuine improvement are never achieved without sacrifice and sacrifice is hard. Our overworked and belabored city officials face a difficult problem, deviled as they are by declining ratables, advancing tax rates, obsolescence, high cost of services and flight of population and industry. It is our job to find a solution for these problems and make their task easier. A large part of this job is in informing the public of the Plan, its objectives and how and why it will help them and their city. Unless they can be sold on a long term basis, the city in the long run will wither and die. It is our job to see that this does not happen.

Finally the city itself must be resold to dwellers, commerce and industry if unjustified decentralization is to be checked and the capital investment is to be preserved and strengthened. An adequate Plan will accentuate and strengthen the inherent advantages of city life and at the same time lessen or eliminate the disadvantages. Without a good Plan the city cannot be resold.

Free flowing highways alone will not solve all the problems of the city and metropolitan area but without such highways the problem cannot be solved at all. Just as the arteries of the body are necessary to carry the blood stream so there must be traffic arteries to carry the life blood of highway transportation in this the automotive age. But there must also be a heart to pump the blood thru the arteries, and lungs to breathe the breath of life into the body. This heart is the over-all basic Plan conceived to match the needs of modern civilization and exploit the potentialities of the automotive age.

We have the tools in our hands and a conception of how to use them is emerging—but people, only people can put these tools to work and achieve better and more prosperous living in metropolitan areas.

Planning for Urban Transit

E. D. MERRILL, President and Chairman of Board of Capital Transit Company, Washington, D. C.

FOR the purpose of this discussion we will confine our attention to public passenger transit operations. We will leave out the very important other elements in the urban transportation picture, such as taxicabs and private automobile transportation, as well as transportation of freight and commodities.

So much has been said about the economical utilization of street space by public transportation as compared with private automobile transportation that we will not attempt to prove what seems to be fully accepted, namely, that public transportation is 7 to 10 times as economical of street space in peak periods as is private automobile transportation.

City planners and authorities have urged in recent years that mass transportation, or public transportation, as I prefer to call it, should carry a greater proportion of the people entering and leaving the central business districts. A realization of this objective will save money which would otherwise be spent for street widening, improved parking facilities and other special provisions for the private automobile user.

It is gratifying to those of us who are engaged in the industry to know that the transit services are valued and we are anxious to assume a larger proportion of the transportation load, provided it can be done without adverse effect upon the financial results of our operations.

We were able to carry a much larger than normal proportion of the load during the war period with very evident effects in reducing street congestion. The shift from private automobiles to public transit by a considerable number of passengers was due to war-time limitations. The transit companies were able to assume the greater volume of travel during the war because a larger load per vehicle was permitted. There were also certain restrictions and limitations on extensions into new territory, and practical limitations created by the shortage of operators and, in some cases, shortage of vehicles. In other words, the higher loads per vehicle made possible the carrying of a larger volume of business with less than normal increase in cost. This obscured the rapidly increasing costs which resulted from higher wage levels, and other increases in expense.

Now that we are returning to peacetime conditions, we are faced with a different situation which makes it of questionable financial benefit to to assume a larger rush hour load. Wages have increased. In some cases they are double what they were prior to the war. The over-loading tolerated during the war is no longer accepted. Extensions into new territory are now constantly demanded and required by public authorities, sometimes even against the advice of the company. In the face of increasing automobile use, it is proposed that transit companies carry a

larger proportion of the rush hour travel by giving more attractive service. This proposal involves higher costs per passenger, particularly when patronage is declining.

When we ask the transit company to assume a greater volume of travel in rush hours, to assist in reducing traffic congestion, a number of problems present themselves.

I might mention a few very briefly:

1. The morning and afternoon rush-hour periods are the critical periods when congestion occurs. For the transit company to add service at those times and assume a greater load means that the cost per passenger of handling this additional business is, I believe, more than twice the cost of handling additional mid-day business. This is because additional facilities,—vehicles, shop and housing facilities—are required for use during only very short periods of the day. This also suggest that express bus service in rush hours, designed to pick up additional business, should be carried on at higher than average rates of fare.
2. As the cities grow and residential areas scatter into the countryside, the transit company must assume longer average hauls, which are costly.
3. The advent of the automobile has made possible the development of scattered residential communities which are situated some distance away from existing transportation, and any transit service rendered to such communities must be carried on at a loss.

It is probable that we cannot stop the trend toward scattered suburban development. There is too much appeal in the wide open spaces and we certainly do not want to go to an extreme in controlling the places where people are permitted to live.

Even the most optimistic forecasts of urban re-development would hardly eliminate the growth of outlying suburbs.

If it seems desirable that public transportation should carry more of the load, what can we do to plan the city and its relations with the transit service so as to accomplish that end?

A number of things occur to me as a result of observing the difficulties under which the transit industry has operated over the years.

A. *The street pattern can be so developed that streets are available for direct public transit service from residential to business areas.* Circumferential routes or crosstown lines should also have direct, freely moving streets, crossing the radial lines at intervals of two or three miles outward from the center of the city.

In order to plan a street pattern, it may be helpful to develop an ideal pattern for street railway, trolley bus or bus routes regardless of presently existing physical and street limitations. In that way any steps which may be taken to develop crosstown or radial arteries may be considered from the standpoint of how well they fit into the ideal pattern. Any such plan would have to be fluid and must be rechecked at frequent intervals to take account of changing trends in population or industrial development.

Long range planning of transit routes is not so simple as it sounds. Often three or more agencies of the city or state government—The Public Utilities Commission, the Planning Authority and the Highway

Department—need to be consulted and their views brought into some degree of consonance with each other and with the plans of the transit operator. It is necessary fully to explain the economics of the business so that plans will not be extravagant. The transit enterprise ought to be on a sound business basis whether operated by a corporation or by the city. I emphasize again the need for fluidity—such plans must be tentative. A serious impediment to planning is the reluctance of the companies to commit themselves to a plan which may prove to be unwise.

Design of the pattern of transportation routes depends upon the typography of the city. Consideration must be given to how far people should be expected to walk to reach public transportation. It has been found through public opinion surveys that a walk of 4 or more blocks may reduce the patronage of public transit, whereas the patronage of residents living 3 blocks from the transit line is virtually as great as that by people living only 1 or 2 blocks away. This suggests radial transit lines 6 to 8 blocks apart in well settled areas.

Three blocks is a shorter walk than has generally been considered a reasonable *limit* in outlying areas where the routes naturally fan out into more widely separated streets. Experience and custom, density of population and topography, in each city will lead to a different pattern as to reasonable length of walk.

B. *Cooperation between municipal authorities, transit operators and real estate developers would be most helpful in regulating the pattern of real estate development and land usage so that a reasonable pattern of public transportation routes would serve the various areas.* In this connection municipal authorities can be helpful in arranging for paving of sturdy construction on those streets which are to carry public transit, assuming that it will be by means of trolley bus or internal combustion motor vehicles rather than street cars. Many instances have occurred where housing developments have been built some distance off the main thoroughfare with inadequate paving on streets leading to the development. Bus lines have been ordered to serve such developments over streets that would not be thought of as permanent routes for public transit. Such illogical routes become fixtures with adverse effect on later economical and convenient routing. The transit company is asked in many cases to serve new areas where present traffic is not sufficient to justify service. Why should not the municipality, on the other hand, pave the main arteries and crosstown routes in advance of the time when they will be fully utilized in order that public transit may be developed in an orderly way and not be subject to shifting back and forth as the streets are made available. Provision for turn-arounds should be made—not only at the most distant terminal of the line but at intervals along the line to permit turn-back service.

Another instance in which city authorities can be helpful is the provision of sidewalks to give access to public transit facilities. We have

had occasional requests for extension of bus lines over what seemed entirely illogical routes merely because sidewalk facilities were not available between new residential developments and transit routes.

This poses a problem in municipal finances and utilization of private property. Progress in solving these problems would materially aid the transit operator in giving better service, so that he can assume the larger load without running into such high costs that increased rates of fare will negate the efforts to carry additional passengers.

C. I have come now to a point which seems to me worth serious discussion but which I realize may be considered a radical departure from previous thinking as to the relationship between the municipality and the transit operator.

It sometimes seems to me that we are suffering from a hangover from the early days of transit service when a franchise was considered a valuable asset and the operation of public transit produced substantial profits. That condition was before my time, and I have been some 35 years in the transit business. *If we are to ask the transit operator to assume costly peak rush hour additions to his service, and extensions into non-paying territory, all with the idea that he should assume a larger proportion of the load and thereby save money for the city, why should we not offer some inducement, or some assistance to the operator in carrying out that objective?* Instead of asking the operator to assume additional losing business without a chance to make up for the losses, why not offer a reduction in taxes in return for his assuming the larger burden of transportation? We need not fear that more than reasonable net income will accrue to the operator. The controls exercised by the various regulating commissions will prevent that. In fact, it would seem to me that city authorities would be well advised to look with some anxiety upon a condition wherein the public transit operator is earning less than a fair return, and that they would be wise to take steps on their own initiative to bring about a more healthy condition. In other words, the draft horse is not only entitled to proper nourishment but it would pay all concerned to see that he gets it. And please don't tell the transit operator that his problems will all be solved by reducing fares and giving more service!

I have never heard of a franchise which offered reduction in taxes if and when the transit system carried, say for instance, over 75 percent of the passengers into and out of the business district during specified rush hours. Perhaps that would be helpful in bringing about a condition which we are all looking for, namely, relief of traffic congestion through more convenient and attractive public transportation service remembering all the time that low rates of fare are an attractive feature which will help in our general objective but which cannot be maintained while the transit operator is subject to increasing costs, high taxes or other requirements which add to his cost.

I am sure the transit operators are genuinely interested in doing everything possible to help in clearing up traffic congestion and in carrying a larger proportion of the traffic, and no doubt we, as transit operators, should do more than we have in the past in the way of explaining the economics of the business to the general public so that all will understand the advisability of mutual, cooperative planning to get the best over-all results.

Relieving Traffic Congestion

ROBERT A. MITCHELL, Chief, Bureau of Traffic Engineering, Philadelphia, Pa.

THIS morning we listened to three fine papers by nationally recognized authorities on separate phases of the urban transportation problem. Urban transportation, as you realize if you didn't before, plays a most important role in today's civilization, the very existence of our cities depends upon highway transportation, in which I include public transit, and the most vitally affected area is the central business district.

A recent Gallup Poll proves conclusively that the traffic problem is considered the number one problem in cities. In the survey, people all over the United States were asked for their loudest urban complaint. In the largest cities, over 500,000 population, 37 percent listed poor housing and 31 percent traffic conditions, but in all cities below 500,000 population, traffic conditions led the list with 31 percent in medium sized cities and 19 percent in small cities.

It has been already agreed, I believe, that traffic congestion in central business districts has been largely responsible for the migration of business to outlying areas of a city, commonly known as *decentralization.* Figures are available to show the tens of millions of dollars loss in central district real estate values that this has created in each of our larger cities, this at a time when the cost of operating a city has about doubled in the past ten years.

There appears, however, to be a difference of opinion between City Planners and Traffic Engineers as to whether decentralization is harmful to a city's future. Most City Planners I have talked to believe decentralization is inevitable, that it is a healthy trend and will not deter the economy or growth of a city. Traffic Engineers, on the other hand, believe that the central business district of a city must be kept healthy and alive if the city is going to advance or even continue its present economic position.

Regardless of which point of view is correct, and only the future can decide, business interests and public officials in most of the cities over 100,000 population are worried about traffic congestion in the central business district. As Chairman of the American Road Builders Association's Committee on Traffic, I have circulated questionnaires in over

100 cities requesting facts regarding their downtown traffic problem. Replies from 50 cities show, in the opinion of responsible city officials, that in all cases they are faced with traffic congestion in the central business districts. Officials in 44 of these cities stated definitely that congestion was adversely affecting business.

Parking Demand in Philadelphia. In Philadelphia, for instance, in 1925, an average of 60,000 motorists drove into the central business district during a twelve-hour day. Today the total is 150,000, an increase of 150 percent which is more than the narrow streets can effectively accommodate, even with parking restricted on 448 blocks of the 728 blocks in the area. When you drive into the center city at 9:00 A.M. you have one chance in a hundred of finding a parking space at the curb. At noon you have less than one chance in a thousand. If you patronize a parking lot or garage, you're one of approximately 100,000 motorists competing for 20,000 pay-as-you-park spaces. This emphasizes Mr. Tobin's statement on the importance of providing terminals in solving the city's transportation problem.

The application of techniques developed by the Traffic Engineering profession for improving traffic conditions on existing streets, is the first step that should be taken to relieve traffic congestion. For instance:

1. Proper location, timing and coordination of traffic signals will provide for a much smoother flow of traffic and reduce delays.
2. Changing the direction of traffic from two-way to one-way on a pair or pairs of streets eliminates conflicts from turning vehicles, provides more lane capacity, improves traffic signal coordination and reduces accidents.
3. A system of through streets with intersecting traffic controlled by traffic signals or stop signs, no crossing of traffic at minor streets and the elimination of left turns on the through street during peak hours, will definitely expedite the movement of traffic in and out of the central business district.
4. The substitution of buses or trackless trolleys for track-bound street cars has done much to eliminate congestion and improve transit operation. This idea cannot be entirely credited to Traffic Engineers and it would prove a boomerang should rubber again become scarce.

In some cases, putting into effect these improvements will relieve downtown congestion, at least for a while. In many cities, however, increased traffic on the streets has created congestion, in spite of these improvements and more drastic steps are required. In general, these are the elimination of curb parking (in Philadelphia it was found that shoppers represented only three percent of the curb parkers); the establishment of additional off-street parking facilities; plans for express highways to tap the district; and a long-range program looking towards the building of off-street parking and loading space in or adjacent to new or altered buildings which are generators of traffic.

Each city has its own peculiarities and characteristics; therefore, methods that work in one, might not be applicable to another. It is not too difficult for an experienced traffic engineer to recommend workable improvements after a careful appraisal of the city's traffic conditions.

Public opinion, however, is not usually satisfied with the opinion of an authority unless it is backed up by facts. It is my experience that no change should be made until the proper surveys have been made accurately to determine the existing traffic and transportation characteristics. I have known several instances where parking restrictions were rescinded by city officials because they had no facts to combat the pressure from merchants who insisted that the restrictions were causing them to lose business.

Practically all of the information needed can be obtained from the Origin-and-Destination Survey, combined with a check of parking conditions in the central business district. No doubt all of you are familiar with these surveys which were developed by the Public Roads Administration and completed or underway in some 60 cities. Unfortunately, over a year passes, in most cases, before the information obtained in these surveys is available for use—by that time, conditions may have changed. I find that almost as accurate a picture of traffic conditions in a central business district can be obtained by a curb parking survey, an off-street parking survey, a shopper's mode of transportation survey and a cordon count of vehicles and people entering and leaving the district, all of which can be made and analyzed within 30 to 60 days. Philadelphia's ban on daytime parking on the streets of the central business district in 1946, was based on the information obtained in the above type of surveys. This was sufficient to convince the downtown merchants that traffic movement and not curb parking was beneficial to their business. These restrictions have been in effect and adhered to for almost two and one-half years. Business has steadily improved and merchants are the first to complain against any let-up in enforcement.

Transit officials tell us we can solve the problem by making everybody ride on transit vehicles in or out of the district.

In the May issue of *The American City* magazine, Prof. Theodore Caplaw of the University of Minnesota, in an article entitled "Express Transit Streets To Speed All Traffic," suggests this as a solution other than decentralization. He says, "A third possibility is to find some way to persuade people to abandon forms of transportation which require a great deal of space per person in favor of those requiring very little. Even more plainly, it means a shift from private automobiles to public carriers for transportation in and out of the business district." His solution is based on the setting aside of express streets for the sole use of transit vehicles.

We appreciate the fact that this is theoretically true; any intelligent person can see that a street car or bus will carry many more people per square foot of roadway than a passenger automobile, normally carrying only one or two persons; but the proposal is not practical nor popular. The steady increase in automobile registration bears witness

to that. We can't solve the problem entirely by mass transportation.

The logical solution seems to be to take the following steps:

1. See that the existing street system is used to its maximum capacity for the movement of traffic and the temporary storage of commercial vehicles while loading and unloading. This might require the elimination of all passenger vehicle parking on some or all of the streets. Restricting the hours of loading and unloading would further improve traffic movement but there are a number of factors which make this difficult.

2. Make transit riding more attractive and personalized so as to encourage, at least, the people who work in the central business district to use mass transportation instead of their own automobiles. Our study showed 55 percent of the cars parked in downtown parking lots and garages were owned by people who work downtown. Transit companies cannot be expected to operate at a loss, so higher fares will be required.

3. Provide off-street parking facilities for the passenger vehicles of the people who shop or otherwise bring business to the downtown area. If the 55 percent of all day parkers mentioned above could be encouraged to leave their cars home or in fringe parking lots, then only a few rather than thousands of additional off-street parking spaces would be needed.

4. Require the establishment of off-street loading bays for commercial vehicles in or adjacent to all new or remodeled buildings that depend upon truck transportation so as eventually to eliminate the use of the streets for loading and unloading. There is no more logical reason why the main streets of a city should be used for conducting private business than the main line tracks of a railroad. No businessman would ever think of asking railroad officials to permit him to store a freight car on a main line track while it was being loaded or unloaded.

5. Improve or add to the existing street system, through a master city plan, so that it can move traffic without unnecessary delays. This would involve some grade separated highways and the widening of some existing streets. Here again, elimination of the automobiles of workers in the district might make the existing street system adequate.

It is all well and good to talk about what should be done to relieve downtown congestion, but are we going to do anything about it? There are so many different interests affected by changes in traffic conditions that public officials hesitate to take any action for fear of displeasing one group or the other. You can take it from me, there is no traffic regulation or so-called improvement which satisfies everybody.

The answer is to organize an official citizens advisory committee, composed of representatives from the outstanding business and civic organizations in the community. Let them get together, under expert guidance, study the facts, hash over the problems, iron out their differences and then present an agreed upon program to the city government. City officials will then proceed to see that the improvements are made because they can be assured of active support from private interests.

Discussion

HENRY COHEN, Research Associate Institute of Urban Land Use and Housing Studies, Columbia University, *Reporter*

The prepared discussion papers and the general discussion at the session on Urban Transportation revolved about four points:

1. The assembly of people and goods (terminals and yards) are as important a consideration in planning for urban transportation as are the technical problems in moving people and goods (routes, conveyances, etc.)

2. Adequate planning of urban transportation must relate to land-use planning.

3. Basic criteria in urban transportation planning are elements of time, cost, and convenience.

4. Because of the peculiar service nature of urban transportation special problems arise, *e.g.*, peak hour congestion, financial loss in maintaining transit runs in low-use areas and during low-use hours.

In the discussion, comments were made in regard to the relationship between parking and transit. Additional observations were made in regard to: government subsidy of marginal runs; zone fares; use of surface transit as a means of avoiding present high construction costs of subway rapid transit systems.

While touching on many significant aspects of transportation planning, the discussion unfortunately neglected the passenger. It would have been extremely important to focus more on the role of the passenger and citizen in transportation planning. For example:

1. In what ways is the urban population being affected by conditions of mass transit?

2. What educational methods can be used to improve passenger habits on mass transit facilities?

3. How can passengers (citizens) be aroused to an intelligent consideration of transportation conditions in their communities?

4. How can the criteria of time, cost, and convenience be further refined and integrated so that we may begin to conceive the desirable, humanized transportation system we can afford to have in our cities? (Such a conception is a prerequisite in thinking about a "new urbanism)".

Unless we soon get at the heart of the transportation problem, we shall shortly have to begin pouring cottonseed oil into our conveyances to complete the identification of the species *homo sapiens* with the sardine.

Round Table on Urban Redevelopment

PANEL: Paul Oppermann, Urban Planning Officer, FWA, Washington, D. C., *Chairman;* David M. Walker, Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority, *Reporter;* Edmund M. Bacon, Senior Land Planner, Philadelphia City Planning Commission; Carle N. Barber, Chairman, Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority; George F. Emery, Planning Director, Detroit City Planning Commission; Clark S. Hobbs, Vice-President, Goucher College, Baltimore; James H. Inglis, Director-Secretary, Detroit Housing Commission; John P. Robin, Executive Director, Pittsburgh Redevelopment Authority; Anatole A. Solow, Pan American Union, Washington, D. C.

The conferees generally agreed that one of the most serious problems confronting the urban redevelopment authorities was the high cost of land acquisition. This, of course, has been the obvious obstacle to redevelopment, but it remains a problem that must be solved in order to make large scale work possible. The Pennsylvania delegates advocated state aid, with the possibility of matching contributions in the form of tax rebates from the cities participating.

Edmund N. Bacon described the redevelopment plan prepared by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission for the East Poplar Area. This plan proposed the rehabilitation of several blocks by a private non-profit group, the development of new recreation facilities and creation of a new community center, the clearance of some "sore spots" and the building of public low rent housing in these areas, and an active conservation program for the remainder of the area.

Mr. Bacon stressed his belief that by a combination of these various factors, existing values in the area could be preserved to the greatest extent and a new neighborhood morale introduced into the area which would inspire property owners in a considerable part of it to put forth extra effort to keep their properties in repair.

He stated his belief that through skillful physical planning and neighborhood organization, a major contribution of redevelopment could be the stimulation of a new neighborhood pride which would encourage active conservation of areas much larger than those effected by actual structural changes.

Clark Hobbs of Baltimore thought that we may as well recognize the fact that redevelopment is a possibility only if land density is increased in order to support high land cost. Baltimore, he said, is currently moving toward the development of a project along these lines. It was suggested that this principle must be recognized but that considerable care must be taken to preserve esthetic values in handling such construction.

The delegates from Philadelphia thought that the land densities must not be increased, but rather slightly decreased, with an effort to explore the possibility of removing legal road-blocks to tax abatement in order to care for excess land cost. The delegates from Pittsburgh and Philadelphia thought that some partial help might be found in the re-

development of opportunity areas where land might be assembled that would bring a profit that could be applied to other areas. Such opportunity areas might be either for commercial or industrial uses.

It was pointed out that the redevelopment authorities cannot ignore the need for action in these two important fields. Their relation to city life is a vital one and opinion in both Pittsburgh and Philadelphia is that action should begin in such areas.

In Philadelphia currently there are two projects under way that will in all probability materialize. One is the redevelopment of a part of a large commercial area where land can be assembled at less than its assessed value. The other is a rehabilitation project being undertaken in a slum district by a non-profit corporation using FHA Title VI financing. It was pointed out that the possibilities of FHA financing should not be neglected in the future. Under Title VI provision could be made for funds. (The provisions of Title VI were renewed by the Special Session of the 80th Congress.)

George F. Emery of Detroit outlined the situation in his city. Said he:

> The Urban Redevelopment Corporation Law, being Act 250 of the Public Acts of 1941, authorizes the formation of the corporations for redevelopment projects. Under this law such corporations have certain privileges and are also subject to special controls by the city. Under it the city condemns land for the corporation. The location and redevelopment plan of the project are subject to approval by the City Plan Commission. The law makes it possible to freeze the assessed value of a project after redevelopment has been completed, but makes no provision for abatement of taxes or freezing of assessed values before redevelopment.
>
> The Rehabilitation of Blighted Areas Law, Act 344, Public Acts of 1945, authorizes the city to condemn land in blighted areas for the purpose of eliminating blight. The law requires the city to have a Master Plan and also calls for approval by the Plan Commission of the Plan of Redevelopment. Provisions are included to necessitate that other suitable housing be available to displaced owners.
>
> There is also the Housing Commission Law which is Act 18 of the Public Acts of 1933 which authorizes the formation of local housing commissions with powers for slum clearance and low-rent housing. The Urban Redevelopment Project now under way in Detroit utilizes the Housing Commission Law for the purpose of acquisition. The project is a badly blighted area which has been declared a slum. The Housing Commission is at present acting as the Redevelopment Agency for Detroit. The Housing Commission has agreed to select slum clearance and redevelopment project areas in accordance with the Master Plan of Redevelopment, which indicates 1,600 acres for redevelopment for residential purposes and 1,100 acres for redevelopment for industrial purposes. The project will be financed through city tax funds. An appropriation of one million dollars has already been made towards the cost of condemnation and additional sums will be provided. It is estimated that the revenues obtainable from sale of the project area as sites for redevelopment will return around 25 percent of the cost. The difference will be absorbed by the city and will form a subsidy to the redevelopment. It is thought that the redeveloped area will pay a much higher tax return and that increase in taxes will ultimately more than equal the initial subsidy.

In Providence the urban redevelopment program has been developed by the local redevelopment agency working in close cooperation with the City Planning Commission. Eight projects have been designated and approved. A $2,000,000 bond issue is being submitted to the voters in November for the purchase of the land. (The redevelopment bond

issue was passed, as the ANNUAL went to press, with the highly favorable vote of 27,000 for the issue and 13,000 opposed.)

According to the Providence statement:

Of the eight areas designated, six are in outlying locations. Two projects are in arrested areas. The intent is to begin redevelopment in such a manner as to limit as much as possible the demolition of existing usuable housing, in view of the continuing shortage of dwelling space. Seven hundred to 950 new dwellings could be built on the first five sites proposed. A total of fourteeen hundred to twenty-two hundred units would be supplied if all eight were to go forward.

The Redevelopment Agency estimates the fair market value of the five sites ready for redevelopment at $1,300,000, involving a net cost to the Agency of $700,000 when sold for redevelopment, with a prospective increase in local taxes of three and one-half to five million dollars. The Providence Redevelopment Agency has encouraged representative private groups to participate in the job.

It was stated that the Chicago redevelopment program is closely geared with municipal public housing. Eight proposed sites.

The Chicago statement declared:

The Chicago redevelopment program is closely geared with municipal public housing. Eight proposed sites have been approved by the State Housing Board. Thirty million dollars of municipal funds are available for acquisition and clearing of slum land, to relocate families occupying areas to be cleared and to construct low-rent housing. Chicago voters approved a bond issue last fall, supplementing funds already available from state and city sources. It is expected that 1200 low-rent units will be supplied at the outset for families displaced in the redevelopment areas.

The New York Life Insurance Company has offered to pay the Chicago Land Clearance Commission fifty cents a square foot for about sixty acres on which to build a project of 1400 family dwelling units. Present estimates of rentals would be $75 to $80 for a 3½ room unit and from $90 to $100 for a 4½ room unit.

Action on the offer requires approval of the City Council of Chicago and the Illinois State Housing Board.

Anatole A. Solow made a plea for adequate standards which he thought offered the key to the success of urban redevelopment:

At present, it appears questionable whether urban redevelopment will greatly improve the life of the urban family, because too much attention is being devoted to legal and financial technicalities and too little to the actual physical standards.

In one of the most brilliant pieces of analysis—in this particular case, of Stuyvesant Town—Tracy Augur asked: "Does this project represent the dawn of a new day or the afterglow of an old one? Is it a step forward or a step backward?" While questioning the basic soundness of such projects, he did not see any particular difference whether densities run 4, 5, or 600 to the net acre. I am inclined to agree. When you reach densities of this magnitude, further excess hardly matters. I will also agree that New York is a special case and, as Tracy Augur put it in 1944: "People will live there if they like it and will not, if they do not." For, indeed, in a society which cherishes free choice, people can always move to the farms even if they have to starve there. An excuse is made, for instance, for the lack of schools in Stuyvesant Town on the ground that the 8,800 dwellings will be inhabited by family types without children. Could there be a more degrading mental approach than to visualize a community of 24,000 people living without children around them?

It is a tragic fact that density standards should be governed by purely economic considerations. Yet, even the first year planning student learns that densities should be based on considerations of livability, need for open space, light and air. We have, I believe, the right to insist that the most rigid standards be imposed by planning and rehabilitation agencies in the public interest, since urban rehabilitation will depend on some form of public subsidy.

Round Table on Zoning

PANEL: Flavel Shurtleff, *Chairman;* Paul F. Croley, Philadelphia; Malcolm H. Dill, Baltimore; Harold M. Lewis, New York City; Robert Kingery, Chicago; David Levin, Washington, D. C.; George G. Hayward, Ft. Wayne, Ind.; J. P. Conners, Martinez, Calif. A. H. C. Shaw, Cleveland, *Reporter.*

Chairman Shurtleff led off the discussion with the observation that many cities throughout the country are revising or seriously considering revising their zoning ordinances, that hundreds of zoning ordinances are more than 20 years old and in need of being brought up to date. He cautioned, however, against the adoption of untried regulations without testing them as to reasonableness and probable reaction of the courts.

The subjects touched upon in the discussion which followed included: Off-street parking, residence development plans, deed restrictions, the use of old mansions, the effect upon the community of the more intensive use of such buildings, truck traffic and loading, zoning around airports, radio towers, dangers of upward revision in zoning and enforcement.

It was generally agreed that the regulation of off-street parking on private property should be provided for in a zoning ordinance, since zoning is the regulation of private property in the interest of the general welfare.

Mr. Levin described his work as research engineer with the Federal Public Roads Administration and some of the material in the third report of that organization about to be released. Its studies on truck loading and auto traffic covered 150 cities, 66 of which have ordinances regulating truck loading. Two-thirds of the cities of 50,000 and under provide regulations in their zoning ordinances. Most of the regulations apply to downtown areas where the parking generators are most numerous. He said the regulations should apply to the remodelling of old buildings as well as new buildings, but should not be retroactive. Many off-street parking ordinances are modeled after that of Arlington, Va.

Mr. Arthur Comey, Boston, maintained that the usual provisions for off-street parking are too vague.

Mr. Fox, New York City, was for removing the ban on garages and parking lots in downtown New York City, although he deplored the dismal effect of too many parking lots in downtown Boston.

Mr. Croley was in favor of fringe parking areas because a survey showed that only 15 percent of downtown shoppers used private transportation. He objected to garages or parking lots with driveways across the sidewalks of busy streets, especially within 100 feet of a street intersection.

Mr. Goodrich, New York City, cited an old pre-Elizabethan English law which forebade the storage (parking) of goods and vehicles on public highways.

Mr. Shurtleff described a provision in a New England ordinance which provides a special parking district adjoining a business district where, behind the business district, there is a 200-foot strip of land reserved for public parking purposes only. A similar provision in the Cleveland Heights zoning ordinance was cited.

As to the ratio of parking space to the floor space of the parking generator, *Mr. John O. Preston* said the Miami ratios are 100 percent of the first floor plus 50 percent of the second floor and 25 percent of the third floor; that every plan for a new building must show the parking space to be provided; that the amount of parking space for each type of use is indicated; that nothing is left to the whim of an administrator. Parking lots for churches were discussed. So far as *Mr. Kingery* knew, no court had yet ruled on parking lot provisions.

Mr. Hayward described a Ft. Wayne zoning provision which sets forth the requirements for laying out complete residence development units of not less than 4 acres, including local shopping centers.

Mr. Lawrence Copley, Memphis, advised against such projects being made a special zoning district, but recommended that the zoning map be amended to provide for the development. To discourage housing developments without the approval of the Planning Commission, he said water, sewers, utilities, street improvements and house numbers should be refused.

The enforcement of deed restrictions under the zoning ordinance received some attention. While *Mr. Preston* said it is common in Florida to include enforcement of deed restrictions in the zoning ordinance, *Mr. Fox* advised against such practice. It was suggested that plat restrictions—setback lines on the allotment plat, may well be recognized in the enforcement of the zoning ordinance where the plat restriction is greater than the setback line provided in the ordinance.

The perennial question of what to do with the obsolete mansion prompted some discussion. *Mr. Lewis* mentioned provisions made in several New England zoning ordinances for utilizing such houses for more intensive residence use without their multi-family use being too apparent from the outside.

Mr. Kingery brought up the question of the effect of this changed use upon the tax value of the property and of the neighborhood. *Mr. Preston* said, in Florida, statements are required each year for assessment purposes.

Caution was advised in rezoning to higher use districts. A New Jersey case was cited where an injunction was granted against rezoning a piece of property from a business district to a residence district. The change had been made arbitrarily without general approval. *Mr. Kingery* said an Illinois court had ruled likewise under similar circumstances. With all cities being zoned with much more business and commercial frontage than will ever be used, it was urged that upward re-

zoning should be attempted only after much study and missionary work on the part of planners and then on the basis of reasonableness.

Mr. Brown, St. Louis, brought up the question of radio towers as high structures in residence districts. Several ordinances permit such towers if accessory to a building. Approval of the FCC was recommended.

In the matter of prohibiting habitations in industrial districts, a court case in New Hampshire was cited in which such a regulation was upheld where the land was subject to overflow. No court decision was cited where the limitation is for the protection of the industrial district against the intrusion of dwellers who are potential objectors to industrial operations.

Inquiry was made about zoning around airports. Those with experience recommended that the port land be large enough that runways for landing and taking off and space for warming up be far enough back from the boundaries to minimize danger to property on the outside and to permit a reasonable use of surrounding private property.

A lament went up over the lack of enforcement of the zoning regulations in some of our large cities during and since the recent war. Apparently the problem has been too big for the limited enforcing agents. The remedy seemed to be rezoning where the changed conditions have been noticeable. A simplification of zoning regulations was urged in the face of the tendency to make revisions more complicated.

Thruout the session the discussion was animated and the subject was not exhausted when time was called twenty minutes late.

THE NEWARK PLAN

Introduction

Hon. VINCENT J. MURPHY, Mayor

THE Master Plan for the physical development of our City, is a result of three years of hard work and careful study by expert City Planners, Officials, and Employees of our Municipal Government and our Board of Education, and Citizens' Advisory Committees with members having an expert knowledge of the field upon which they are called to advise.

This Master Plan was *legally adopted* by the Central Planning Board on *July 10*, 1948, and is now the official blueprint to guide the future development of our City. It is *not a rigid or fixed plan*, but, instead, is sufficiently elastic to permit revision as time and circumstance warrants.

There is *no ivory tower dreaming* in this Plan although the Planning Board has done its utmost to *keep its sights raised* above ordinary commercial and industrial demand, in order to prepare for a truly adequate City in which we will all be happy to work and happy to live.

The Plan is practical and can be accomplished through united citizen effort. Despite the tremendous sums of money involved, all proposed improvements can be made and our tax rate gradually reduced; with the only *if* in this respect being the budgeting of the cost of the improvements as scheduled in the Master Plan.

Newark, as you know, *is an old City*—281 years old, as a matter of record—and the shadow of age has been hovering over us for many years. Our slum areas have long been a shame and a disgrace; our street system, planned and laid out to accommodate horse-drawn vehicles, is totally inadequate to handle modern traffic; in fact, the impact of motorized transit is causing the slow strangulation of our Central Business District.

Parking of motor vehicles has become such a problem that *merchandizing and industrial* units are *moving* to outlying *suburbs* in order to properly accommodate their own transportation system and vehicles of their customers.

All of these things have created the municipal problem known as *decentralization* which is nothing more or less than the movement of citizens, stores, and commercial and financial houses away from run-down and worn-out sections of the City that are displeasing in themselves, and, therefore, harmful to both business and satisfactory residential living. But decentralization is an ever-growing and ever-widening process; first affecting the central city, it moves into our residential and outlying areas, then into satellite communities and eventually into new territory, not connected with the central city of its origin.

In charting the course of decentralization in our major American

Cities over the past few decades, we find that no satisfactory solution has yet been developed. Moving to a suburban or satellite community does give the required breathing space, but, as payment for this, extracts its toll in commuting time and costs to the firmly established, industrial, financial, and commercial houses of the central city.

These studies have led to the consensus among planning authorities that the *only answer* is the *continuing building* and *re-building* of established areas to conform with *industrial* and *commercial* demands and the *firm* and *positive restriction* of *residential areas* to *housing* types and needs. We propose to do that to the City of Newark in our Master Plan:

First, the re-building of our traffic system with properly planned major and arterial highways, limited access freeways, secondary arteries, and residential streets and channel traffic into the City to its destination, and return, without congestions.

Second, the building of sufficient off-street parking facilities in our shopping areas will permit our business houses again to enjoy the patronage of all citizens in the metropolitan area—an area, by the way, with a population of 1,500,000 persons.

Third, the setting up of neighborhood units throughout the City with through streets on the boundaries of each neighborhood and restricted thoroughfares within those boundaries, to remove the blight of excess traffic from urban living.

Fourth, the abolishment of our slum areas by razing every substandard and dilapidated structure in those areas and rebuilding, with modern housing units, on the basis of population density and area coverage, will give to all of our citizens a place in which they can live happily and properly rear their children.

Fifth, the establishment of a co-ordinated and integrated school system will permit a good education without endangering the child, in crossing traffic arteries or traveling too great a distance from home. The enlarging of practically all of our school sites to permit adequate recreation areas, not only for the child, but for the adult as well, will again make the school the center of neighborhood living and community interest. (If we can accomplish that we can once again restore the civic pride that was so important a part in the building of our Country and in projecting the finest type of local government ever known to man.)

Sixth, the building of a modern Cultural Center to aid esthetic development and a large Convention Hall and Sports Arena to attract visitors to our City will also help to restore that civic pride we need.

All of these things are important in themselves and yet, they are worthless from a civic viewpoint unless coordinated in their development. That is the purpose of a Master Plan!

Our *studies* on *population* led us to the *conclusion* that there will be a *steady decline* unless the City is made more attractive to its industries and its inhabitants. If the trends established during the past three

decades continue for the next thirty years, Newark will have a population of only 380,000 in 1950; 342,000 in 1960; 308,000 in 1970, and (unofficial) 445,000 in 1947.

We are firmly *convinced* that the carrying out of the Master Plan in Newark can *reverse this downward trend* and increase our population to a minimum of *472,000 persons* in 1970.

First, the *shifting* of *population* within the City, since *1920*, has serious implications, *half* of our habitable area having lost population.

Second, the *racial characteristics* of Newark's population have undergone *tremendous changes* in the past *three decades.*

Last, but most alarming, is the fact that the *population* of Newark is *growing older* in *group average.* For instance, in *1940*, *21.1 percent* of our population was in the group *up to 14* years of age, *whereas* in *1910* *29.5 percent* of our population was in this group. In *1940*, *26.5 percent* of our population was *45 years and older;* only *17.5 percent* in *1910.*

These statistics are certainly alarming in this, the second most densely populated city in America. When we couple with these population statistics, the fact that out of our *118,550 dwelling units*, *30.8 percent*—or *38,423 units*—need *major repairs*, or lack private baths, toilets or water supply, we wonder that Newark is still a major American city.

In *1935*, a *real property inventory* of this City, conducted by the State Housing Authority, showed that *10.9 percent* of the *total number* of *residential structures* were *no longer fit* for *human habitation.* That was twelve years ago. *Further depreciation* since that time has raised this percentage from *10.9 percent* to approximately *14 percent.*

The *disheartening part* of this picture is that *82.7 percent* of *our dwelling units* are *occupied* by *tenants.* This means that appealing to Newark's citizens to rehabilitate their properties would only be 20 percent effective, even if complete cooperation was possible. The owners of the other 80 percent are quite obviously interested only in the immediate dollar and cents return they receive from their properties.

Our *studies show* also that *27.6 percent* of all residential *structures* in Newark were *built prior* to *1900* and *another 41.1 percent* were *built* between *1900–1919.*

Newark, too, is an industrial City and a large segment of our population does not have an income sufficient to occupy new and adequate housing under existing prices and conditions. In *1940* the *average monthly rental* for the *entire City* was *$33.36 per month. Nineteen percent* of all *housing* units rented for *less than $20* per month. As you all know, very little new housing has been provided in Newark since 1929. All of these facts taken together, prove beyond question that large areas in Newark must be demolished and entirely re-built. In the *next 25 years 55,500 new dwelling units* must be constructed *in Newark* to keep pace with demands from new families and to eliminate present sub-standard conditions.

The Central Planning Board

HON. PETER A. CAVICCHIA, Commissioner, Newark, N. J.

THIS Forum-Discussion will be on the master plan for the city of Newark, New Jersey, as officially adopted by our Central Planning Board on July 10, 1947. The need for such a plan to guide the physical development of this city became apparent many years ago, but it was not until June 16, 1943, that the Newark City Commission decided to take advantage of the Municipal Planning Enabling Act as recorded in the New Jersey Revised Statutes 40: 55–1 to 40:55–21, and appoint a Planning Board for the purpose of evolving a master plan for the general development of the city, and a specific public works program for postwar operation and development.

This legislative act permits the governing body to create, by ordinance, a Planning Board, consisting of the Mayor, as an ex-officio member; one of the officials of the municipality, to be appointed by the Mayor; a member of the Governing Body, to be appointed by it; and five other citizens of the municipality, to be appointed by the Mayor. This makes a Planning Board of nine members.

The act provides that the Planning Board shall elect its Chairman from among the citizen members and also gives it the power to employ experts and a staff. Dependent, of course, upon the budget allotted to the Planning Board by the Governing Body.

When the Master Plan, or any portion of it, is adopted by the Planning Board, it becomes the official Master Plan for the city, and thereafter any proposed deviations from the plan must be referred to the Planning Board for approval and report, and, if the Planning Board disapproves of such proposed change in the Master Plan, then this disapproval can only be overruled by a recorded vote of not less than two-thirds of the entire membership of the Governing Body.

The State Act also permits the Mayor to appoint a Citizens Advisory Committee to collaborate with the Planning Board in its studies, and empowers the Advisory Committee to elect its own officers and determine its procedure.

In this City, Mayor Murphy appointed a Citizens Advisory Committee of approximately 200 men and women and every facet or part of our Master Plan was studied and reported on by the sub-committees of this Citizens Advisory Committee.

After the appointment of the Planning Board and its Citizens Advisory Committee, it soon became apparent that expert technical advice was necessary to the preparation of a comprehensive Master Plan for Newark, and in January of 1944, the Planning Board employed the firm of Harland Bartholomew and Associates, for a term of three years, to develop and advise upon a Master Plan.

The plan was evolved in a series of individual reports, 13 in number, and devoted to particular phases of city development—such as Zoning, Housing, Streets, Transportation, Recreation Facilities, Schools, Parks, Public Buildings, and finally a capital expenditure program and policy. As each report was submitted to the Central Planning Board by Harry W. Alexander, our Resident Planner, and a member of the Bartholomew firm, it was referred to one of the Citizens Advisory Sub-committees for deliberation and report. These committees functioned splendidly and their suggestions and advice were invaluable in the preparation of the plan.

When these sub-committees had completed their studies and made their report, they referred the subject-matter back to the Planning Board—where further study was made of the report of our technical Advisers and the suggested recommendations and changes by the Citizens Advisory Sub-committees. The Planning Board then directed the preparation of a final report on the particular subject and forwarded it to the governing body for study and suggestion. When all of these individual reports had been completed and acted upon, the Central Planning Board, on July 10, 1947, adopted this series of reports as the Official Master Plan for the City of Newark.

We do not consider this plan to be perfect. As a matter of fact, we realize that it will have to be altered and adjusted from time to time to meet public needs and demands that are at present unforseeable. We do say, however, that this Master Plan is based on the finest technical advice available and is the product of the deliberations and conclusions of a representative body of Newark citizens. In short, it can truly be said to be the people's plan and we who have worked upon it are firmly convinced that it is financially possible and a workable chart to a greater future for our city.

The Master Plan of Newark, New Jersey

HARRY W. ALEXANDER, Harland Bartholomew & Associates,
St. Louis, Mo.

NEWARK, the largest city in New Jersey, had in 1940 a popu'ation of 429,000. While essent'ally a part of the New York Region, Newark is also the center of a large and populous metropolitan area of its own, embracing some 400 square miles of area and containing nearly one and one-quarter million people. The Newark metropolitan area comprises all of Essex County and parts of Union, Bergen, Passaic, Hudson and Morris Counties in northern New Jersey. Its area is one of the most important industrial centers in the country.

Like many of the older central cities throughout the United States, decentralization of population and the general slowing down of urban growth has resulted in Newark's losing population between 1930 and

1940. During this period the suburban communities surrounding the City continued to expand.

Newark's natural advantages are such that it should continue to maintain its position as a leading industrial community despite certain adverse trends. It is now the center of the richest and most populous urban area in the United States and is the gateway through which passes the great bulk of goods and people to and from New York City and the West and South. It has a large reservoir of skilled labor and unexcelled transportation facilities including the Central Railroad of New Jersey, the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western, the Erie, Lehigh Valley, and the Pennsylvania. The City also possesses unexcelled air and water transportation facilities in the Newark Marine Terminal and its Airport. These latter facilities have recently been turned over to the Port of New York Authority for future development and operation.

Much of Newark's industrial strength lies in the diversification of its industries. The most important include chemicals, non-ferrous metals, electrical equipment and machinery, food products, iron, apparel, meat packing, textile products, machinery and leather. While Newark is generally thought of as primarily industrial in character, it is also a very important wholesale and retail trade center and is the home of several large national life and fire insurance companies.

There has been a gradual change in the racial composition of Newark's population. Located adjacent to the portals through which streams of emigrants flowed in the early part of this century, Newark attracted many of the foreign born and in 1910 almost one-third of its population fell within this category. Over the years the percentage has gradually declined until in 1940 about one out of five residents in Newark was born in a foreign country. As the percentage of foreign-born decreased, the number of negroes coming to the city increased and today more than 10 percent of the total population is composed of members of that race.

The basic planning problems in Newark are those commonly faced by our large industrial central cities. Those problems are seriously complicated by the fact that Newark is also a part of a larger metropolitan region.

Because the City has been in existence for almost 300 years it suffers from the infirmities of age. Industrial building obsolescence is high, the street system is outmoded, many of the schools need re-building, and there are extensive slum and blighted areas. During the period of rapid growth the population pressure was so great that many miles of tenements were built to meet the housing demand. Because of its constricted area much overcrowding occurred and there is a great lack of public open spaces. If the Newark Meadows are excluded, the area of the City available for residential development is only 17.6 square miles within which live approximately 450,000 people. The resulting

density of more than 25,000 persons per square mile is approximately the same as that found in New York City, and is about four times that found in Cincinnati.

Lacking any substantial area in which new developments can be made, except by expensive reclamation of the Meadowland areas, Newark's Master Plan is concerned primarily with re-building large portions of the City. This involves the replacement of obsolete housing, the re-arrangement of the street system in these areas and the creation of modern school and recreational facilities throughout the community.

In addition to the imperative need for large scale slum elimination and rehabilitation of residence areas, the City faces the necessity for coping adequately with traffic and transportation problems, including that perennial headache: "What to do about Parking?" It is the purpose of this paper to present a broad outline of the Newark Master Plan. As we proceed you will find that the Plan contains no revolutionary or visionary proposals. It is based on the premise that a community which possesses the fundamental advantages of Newark can be revitalized and made a more attractive place in which to live. The plan envisages Newark's continuation as the industrial, commercial and financial center of the North Jersey area and at the same time recognizes the community of interest existing throughout the metropolitan district even though there are many independent municipalities, each with its own particular problems and separate government. The plan in its broad aspects ignores political boundary lines and takes cognizance of the fact that there is a basic inter-dependence of each community with all of the others in the area. The plan is based on careful analysis of regional population and land use trends and its provisions have been formulated within the framework of the city's financial ability to put them into effect.

The basic elements of the Plan comprise land use and zoning; housing; major streets; local transportation; rail, water, air and highway transportation; school and recreational facilities; and public buildings. The Plan is also accompanied by a long-range public improvement program co-ordinated with a financial and building program covering a period of 25 years.

Land Use and Zoning. Newark was one of the first cities in the United States to adopt a comprehensive zoning ordinance. This was first done in 1920 prior to the time when the legality of zoning was clearly established. The original ordinance was superseded by a new ordinance in 1930 which is still in effect.

Shortly after initiation of the land-use studies it became apparent that the old ordinance was grossly out of scale with present and future land-use requirements, and that because of the fact that its adoption preceded by many years the preparation of a Master Plan, major adjustments would have to be made if the ordinance was to be an effective

instrumentality in guiding future growth. (The question naturally comes to mind as to how effective any zoning plan can be in a city which is so completely built up as Newark where the vacant lands available for new developments consist almost entirely of scattered small parcels). The proposed zoning ordinance now under consideration by the City Commission is coordinated with the comprehensive plan for redevelopment of many of the obsolete areas of Newark. The ordinance establishes reasonable population density standards as a guide to any rebuilding operations and strengthens the protection given to the stable residential areas in the City. In recognizing the long-range need for alleviating the shortage of parking space the zoning regulations require provision of off-street parking facilities in connection with all new residential construction. Incidentally in Newark the parking problem is not confined to the downtown business district but exists throughout the community due to a serious lack of garage facilities. Many of the City's residential areas consist of narrow lots upon which 3 and 4-story tenement houses have been built closely together. As there is no opportunity to provide garaging on the rear of the lot because of the absence of alleys and lack of driveway space, many thousands of automobiles in Newark are forced to use the public streets for all year storage.

Viewed in the perspective of the entire metropolitan region, the land-use plan established in the proposed zoning ordinance makes Newark the commercial and industrial center of the area and provides for a large multiple-dwelling area adjacent thereto. While many of the suburban towns, such as East Orange, Irvington, and other communities, have extensive apartment house developments, the principal single-family districts lie outside Newark. In fact there are only two relatively small detached-home areas in the City.

The new zoning ordinance also provides for a reduction in the amount of existing commercial zoning.

In passing it should be noted that zoning in New Jersey has certain inherent legal weaknesses. The State Enabling Act makes it impossible to eliminate non-conforming uses by specifically stating that they may be continued without interference. The statutory provisions relating to Boards of Adjustment permit such wide discretion in granting variances and exceptions that in many communities the zoning ordinance has been so changed that it no longer possesses stability and strength. Both of these statutory deficiencies are widely recognized throughout planning circles in the State and corrective legislation is now being considered by the General Assembly.

Major Streets. Those of you who hail from the Middle West and have driven around the Newark area have some conception of the tremendous traffic problems that are plaguing the community. Illustrative of the problems which exist in and near Newark is that exemplified by U. S. Highway No. 1 or N. J. Highway No. 25 which passes alongside

the Newark Airport and connects with the Pulaski Skyway and the Holland Tunnel to New York. This highway is said to be the heaviest traveled of any in the world and on occasions carries in excess of 100,000 vehicles per day. It is now being widened between Newark and Elizabeth to form a dual-dual highway with 4 separate roadways channelized to segregate truck traffic from passenger cars.

The Newark business district and adjacent industrial areas are the principal traffic objectives in the area. In addition there are large volumes of traffic passing through the area from within the State of New Jersey or beyond its limits, such as that which uses Highway No. 1. This through east-and-west traffic formerly was routed through the heart of Newark and twenty years ago the intersection of Broad and Market handled as much traffic as State and Madison in Chicago and other well known street crossings.

It is readily apparent that traffic congestion in Newark is much more than a local problem and if it can be solved at all the remedy lies in securing the closest co-operation between the City and the satellite suburbs, Essex and adjoining counties and the State of New Jersey.

Evolved in co-operation with these agencies, the Major Street Plan provides for a relatively few strategically located limited-access highways designed to facilitate the interchange of traffic between the residential suburbs and the business and industrial centers of Newark and adjacent communities. These limited-access highways are of two types, the freeway and parkway, their essential difference being that commercial traffic is excluded from the parkways. Two freeways connecting the western and southwestern suburbs to the Newark business district are planned. A north-south parkway will extend through the western part of the City near the center of traffic density in Essex County. This parkway will interchange traffic at connections with the two east-west freeways and will not only facilitate local traffic movements but should result in diverting much north-south traffic away from the highly congested central part of the City. The precise location and design of these facilities are now under active study by the State Highway Department and actual construction is expected in the near future.

Supplementing the limited access highways will be a system of distributing streets which will be either country highways, state highways or local thoroughfares mostly at grades. By channelizing as much of the traffic as possible on the grade-separated thoroughfares, it is believed that the surface-street system will be relieved sufficiently of its traffic burden so that it can accommodate local traffic movements without too much difficulty.

Once a city's street pattern has been established, it becomes most difficult materially to change its form. Any program of street improvements, therefore, must be essentially one of minor modifications and adjustments designed to remove the most critical bottlenecks.

The Major Street Plan is also predicated on the belief that the best opportunity for alleviating traffic congestion in the central part of the city lies in the improving of public transportation facilities. This part of the Plan will be discussed later.

Parking. It is extremely doubtful whether any city can provide sufficient off-street parking facilities within its central area to meet demands unless the use of motor vehicles is sharply curtailed. It has been estimated that as much off-street parking space is required in the central business district as the combined floor area of all of the commercial buildings in the area. The day may come when our cities have decentralized to the point that there will be sufficient vacant land or land occupied by unused buildings in downtown business districts to provide this equivalent space. The problem will have automatically solved itself in such an eventuality, but I am afraid we must look for other solutions in the meantime.

Recognizing this fact and believing that the vitality of the Newark business district must be sustained by every possible means, a comprehensive plan for off-street parking facilities was developed in coordination with the proposed plans for improved highway accesses to the central area as described previously. Before making this plan, surveys were conducted to ascertain shopper parking habits and also those of persons employed in the downtown area. These surveys were supplemented by estimates of present off-street storage space available and possible future parking demand. The plan calls for three types of off-street facilities. The first type is for short-time shoppers' parking and consists of a number of multiple-floor open-deck garages located as near as possible to the center of the retail shopping area. These garages would be supplemented by a large underground structure occupying a portion of Military Park in the heart of Newark.

A series of open parking lots around the fringe of the business district, primarily for use for all-day parkers constitute the second part of this program. These lots would be adjacent to bus lines or within walking distance of employment.

A third type of facility, commonly known as the perimeter parking lot, would be established at points outside the central area but adjacent to the city subway system.

It is proposed to create a Parking Authority to undertake the construction of these facilities, the financing to be accomplished by bonds secured by the revenues derived from the projects. A law authorizing the creation of such an Authority is now under consideration by the State Legislature.

Transit. The Newark metropolitan area is one of the most populous communities in the country where mass transportation is furnished almost entirely by bus and trolley-coach. There are only three rail operated lines all of which are connected with the City Subway.

In the year 1945 the Newark and Essex division of the Public Service Corporation operated approximately 43 million miles of transit service. Of this total amount 67 percent was represented by Diesel bus operation; 25 percent by trolley coaches; and eight percent by street railways. The policy of the transit company in substituting rubber tired vehicles for street cars has resulted in a heavy concentration of buses on Broad Street and on Raymond Boulevard. During the peak hour 733 buses and trolley-coaches use certain parts of Broad Street and a somewhat lesser number operate on Raymond Boulevard.

The Transit Plan is based on the premise that every effort should be made to improve service and increase efficiency of the public transportation system in order to encourage its use by people working, shopping or having business to transact in the central business district. Another fundamental objective of the Plan is to reduce the number of surface vehicles operating in the downtown district. No substantial relief of traffic congestion can be achieved otherwise.

Inasmuch as the Newark metropolitan area is the industrial workshop of Northern New Jersey, there is a very substantial movement of passengers from one part of the area to another. Many of these commuters have their business in New York City and reside in and near Newark while many others work in Newark and have their residence elsewhere. In addition to an improved system of local mass transportation, better rapid transit commuter service is needed between North Jersey communities and to New York.

The greatest opportunity for improving local mass transportation service is in making more efficient use of the subway system. At the present time, there are only three lines operating in the subway whereas it has capacity for many more. In view of the operating company's fixed policy of abandoning rail operation in favor of buses and trolley coaches the best future use of the subway seems to be for trolley coaches.

Studies have indicated that it will be possible to provide 8,580 seats per hour in the subway by using trolley coaches as compared to the present approximate 3,000. If the recommended changes are made certain surface bus lines may be routed in the subway with a resultant substantial reduction in the number of vehicles operating in the downtown area. The augmented use of the subway would also provide more convenient and faster service to the western and northwestern suburbs and thus should encourage more people to leave their cars at home and come to town by public transportation.

The local operating company formerly operated street railway lines directly into the Terminal Building at Military Park in Downtown Newark. A number of rail lines from the western suburbs used a tunnel extending from Washington Street, two blocks west of Broad Street, directly to the Terminal structure. Since rail operation was abandoned this tunnel has been used very little. It is proposed to make the necessary

alterations to the structure to accommodate buses and route a number of the lines through the tunnel into the Terminal. This will effect a further reduction in the use of surface streets by public transportation vehicles.

Eventually it is planned to extend the City Subway system to the south and southwest in conjunction with the proposed Route 24 freeway. It is also proposed to extend the present subway from its northern end to Paterson by means of a private right-of-way. If and when these improvements are made, rail operation would be resumed in the subway and convenient transfer points would be established between the suburban transit lines and the subway system. The Plan also contemplates extension of the present Hudson and Manhattan Railroad line from its present terminus at the Pennsylvania Station in Newark southerly to Elizabeth with a branch to the Newark Airport.

Plans for an improved system of commuting facilities within the North Jersey area are now being studied by the Port of New York Authority and the State.

Transportation—Air, Rail and Water. One of Newark's greatest assets is its superb system of co-ordinated rail, water and air transportation facilities.

The Newark Seaport and Airport adjoin one another and are served directly by several railroads. Both ports have been under development by the City of Newark for many years and millions of dollars have been expended in their improvement. Early in the Master Plan program, after exhaustive analyses of past, present and future financing, it was recommended that, because of their regional character and the necessity for coordinating the facilities with others throughout the Newark area, the City should relinquish control of the Airport and Seaport and transfer them to a regional transportation agency. In view of the fact that the Port of New York Authority was eminently well qualified to take over these facilities, improve them to meet future requirements, and to operate them efficiently, it was recommended that negotiations be entered into between the City and the Port Authority seeking transfer of the property. After prolonged negotiations and much public debate, the City of Newark accepted the offer of the Port Authority and the physical transfer of the properties has now been accomplished.

The future of the Master Plan hinged upon the successful consummation of this agreement for if the City of Newark had continued deficit operation of the facilities and had been compelled to make very substantial capital improvements to prevent further obsolescence and to meet future demands, it necessarily would have been compelled to curtail expenditures for other improvements so badly needed in the City's modernization program. The successful culmination of this great endeavor clears the way for carrying out the entire Master Plan without unduly straining the City's financial resources.

In this connection, it is appropriate to pay tribute to Mayor Vincent J. Murphy for the leadership he displayed in the negotiations leading to the transfer of the properties to the Port of New York Authority. Not the least of the difficulties to be overcome was the fact that both ports were occupied by the United States Government and it was necessary to reach agreements with the Army and the Navy and with the War Assets Administration finally to consummate the transfer. The deadly seriousness of all of these negotiations was lessened somewhat during their course by the famous "Battle of Newark Bay" of which most of you no doubt read in the newspapers.

The improvements to be made at the Port and Airport will cost approximately 76 million dollars and will make these two facilities the most modern of any in the country. Eventually 25,000 persons will be employed in the Port area. Revenues accruing to the City and the increased tax valuations resulting from stimulated industrial development will greatly alleviate many of the financial difficulties in which the City now finds itself.

Many of the purely local rail transportation problems were solved in Newark a number of years ago when the Pennsylvania Railroad constructed its new passenger station on Market Street. This modern terminal has its facilities coordinated with the City's subway system, the local bus system and with the network of inter-urban bus lines, and is a fine example of effective integration of the various types of transportation media. There are few serious grades crossing problems as practically all of the main line railroads servicing the territory are elevated.

The principal transportation problems remaining in the Newark area are those connected with the consolidation of numerous scattered rail freight stations and over-the-road truck terminals. Both of these problems have been the subject of much study by the Port of New York Authority and efforts are being continued to secure a more unified system of railroad freight terminals. The Port Authority recently has taken positive action to alleviate much of the congestion caused by delivery of local freight by over-the-road carriers. A new and modern truck terminal is under construction in the eastern section of Newark which, on completion, will result in substantial savings in the cost of delivering goods by trucks throughout the Newark area.

Housing. The Housing Program is one of major importance. In the housing studies, it was found that one-third of the existing dwelling units in Newark were substandard and that more than one-half of all negroes in the City lived in unhealthful and unsuitable quarters. It was further determined that deterioration of housing facilities has become so serious that over 1,200 acres or 8 percent of the entire City area should be completely replanned and rebuilt. These substandard areas contain between 20 and 25 percent of the entire population of the City.

The deplorable housing conditions found in Newark and all other large American cities are the direct result of past methods of community growth and the failure of cities to adopt definite policies either to control or improve these conditions. For many years the older central areas have continued to lose population, many buildings have been abandoned or demolished, deterioration and obsolescence have grown strongly and crime, disease and social deterioration have taken a heavy toll. Tax delinquency has reached serious proportions. The individual property owner is hopeless in the face of these adverse trends. The problem must be attacked at its origin and its origin lies both in the past practices of expediency and *laissez faire* city development and in the failure of the community to realize or to accept its responsibility for these conditions. The comprehensive Housing program for Newark expressed in the simplest terms, will (a) protect home neighborhoods, (b) rehabilitate blighted areas, (c) clear and rebuild slums.

The program calls for strengthening the protection now afforded residential sections of the City where houses are generally of good standard. This can be done by adopting the revised zoning ordinance, exercising good municipal housekeeping throughout the areas and by the organization of neighborhood protective and improvement associations.

Many areas of Newark have not yet reached the state of complete obsolescence or delapidation. Their continued retrogression, however, will eventually result in slums. In these areas, it is proposed by means of a minimum-standard housing ordinance to force the renovation, removal or closing of all substandard dwellings.

One reason why residential areas are no longer desirable is the lack of adequate public open spaces, obsolete and inadequate school and recreational facilities, and excessive commercial and other traffic through the areas. In many instances it will be possible to re-adjust the internal street system by closing unnecessary streets and by improving major thoroughfares which form the boundaries of the district. Gradual modernization of the school system by re-building obsolete structures on enlarged sites will make it possible to provide each neighborhood with complete facilities for recreational and cultural activities centered at the elementary school.

Complete re-development of substandard areas by private enterprise, assisted by the City of Newark, is a vital part of the Master Plan. Upon the success of this program largely depends the future of Newark.

Schools and Recreation. Newark long has recognized the close relationship between education and recreation, and its coordinated system of schools and supervised playgrounds is widely and favorably known. The splendid system of County Parks which has been established throughout Essex County during the past 30 to 40 years is equally well recognized. Branch Brook and Weequahic Parks, together with the

smaller areas developed by the Essex Park Commission, are great assets to the City of Newark, the value of which is difficult to estimate.

Newark's greatest recreational need is for the provision of more small play areas throughout the congested parts of the City in conjunction with modernization of the entire school system. Plans for the location and extent of these play areas are closely coordinated with the Housing re-development plans previously discussed.

At the present time there are 49 elementary schools and one junior high school. In accordance with the plans for reorganization and improvement, the future system will contain 40 elementary schools, two of which will contain junior high school facilities, 11 junior high schools and 2 occupational schools. The re-arrangement of the system involves abandonment of a number of obsolete elementary school buildings and the consolidation of those schools on new sites within redeveloped areas. Most of the modern schools whose locations may be considered permanent lack sufficient site areas. These must be enlarged. The plans also include provisions for additional Senior High Schools.

The Recreational Plan envisages the school as the center for numerous and diverse neighborhood activities. In each residential section of the City and wherever it is possible to secure sufficient area, the future school sites are so designed as to furnish opportunities not only for supervised play but for adult recreation such as is ordinarily found in neighborhood parks. The plan also contemplates improvement of those sections of the Passaic River front which have not been pre-empted by industry. One of the principal planning proposals is the improvement and beautification of Raymond Boulevard which is the principal entrance to the City from the Pulaski Skyway. Fortunately a large share of the waterfront along this important thoroughfare is publicly owned. Near the northern part of Newark there is also a strip of riverfront that has not been built up and which could be improved for recreational purposes.

Public Buildings. Like many cities, Newark's public buildings are scattered and little opportunity exists for creating a Civic Center such as has been done so successfully in St. Louis and Denver. The City's administrative buildings are separated from those of Essex County and the cultural buildings, including the Library and Museum are removed at some distance from either of the above.

Newark lacks facilities for public gatherings, musical events and similar activities. It is proposed to supply this deficiency by erection of a Public Auditorium adjacent to the present Library and Museum, thus creating a cultural center located from the standpoint of centrality and accessibility.

The other principal proposal pertaining to this part of the Master Plan has to do with the improvement of the area lying between the Pennsylvania Railroad Station and Broad Street. The City of Newark owns all of the land bounded by Commerce Street and Raymond Boule-

vard, the Station and Broad Street. Part of this property has been improved by the construction of a large office building and by the City Market. Two vacant lots remain: one opposite the Pennsylvania Station and the other between the City Market and the Raymond-Commerce Building. On the former tract, it is proposed to erect a combined War Memorial and underground parking garage. On the other vacant piece of land, the plan calls for a combined hotel and parking garage to be built by private enterprise under a leasing agreement with the City. The property on either side of these city-owned lands is proposed to be improved by the construction of a large Convention Hall and Sports Arena and by two parking garages adjacent to the War Memorial and the Pennsylvania Station. Eventually it is hoped to eliminate the City Market building to complete a Mall or Plaza extending from the Station and terminating at the proposed hotel. A site is provided in the plan for a future public building of some kind on the east side of the City Market to balance the Sports Arena proposed to be erected on the west side.

Public Improvements Program. Most of the improvements proposed in the Newark Master Plan, as described in this paper, have been programmed for construction during the next 25 years. Careful study of past financial trends and future possibilities have led to the conclusion that practically all of the Master Plan proposals can be carried out and at the same time the future tax can be reduced. Fortunately Newark has progressively reduced its bonded debt until today it is quite reasonable for a city of its size (approximately $50,000,000). If no new public improvements are undertaken the present debt would be entirely extinguished by 1970. The statutory debt limit for Newark is 11 percent of the real estate valuation. The public improvements and financial program are based on the desirability of keeping the future debt well within the statutory limit and the estimates indicate that this can be accomplished.

The estimated cost of carrying out the principal proposals of the plan is 196 million dollars. In addition to Master Plan items there is another 48 million dollars necessary for other public improvements such as a new City Hospital; improvements to the Library and Museum; sewers; construction of new incinerator; and similar improvements.

The City's share of the cost of all of the improvements included in the program is estimated at 100 million dollars. The difference between that and the total figure represents projects to be financed by state, Federal, or county funds, by benefit assessments, by private enterprise and by self-liquidating revenue bonds.

The 25-year program calls for the issuance of general obligation bonds at the rate of 4 million dollars per year for the next 25 years. Reduction of the present bonded debt plus servicing the new debt created by the proposed program will result in keeping the total bonded

debt at its present approximate level for the next few years. If the present inflationary trends are checked and we do not have a serious economic depression, the entire program can be financed and at the same time the tax rate can be reduced.

The general over-all 25-year program is broken down into 5 year periods and each year it is proposed to revise the 5-year program in accordance with needs of the time.

Two milestones have been reached in the planning of Newark. The first milestone was the completion of the Master Plan and its adoption by the Planning Board. It is now official under New Jersey law and all public improvements must be submitted to the Planning Board for a report prior to final authorization.

The second milestone is *this meeting* which has brought together a distinguished assembly of people from all over the country whose attention is centered on planning in general and, at this particular time, on Newark.

It is the purpose of the Newark Central Planning Board, with the assistance of its Citizens' Advisory Committee, to embark on the third phase of the planning program immediately. This part of the program consists of an intensive educational campaign thoroughly to acquaint all of the citizens of Newark with the purposes in view and the need for carrying out the Plan which has just been presented to you. This program has been underway for some time but greater efforts will be extended as a result of the enthusiasm engendered.

Discussion

J. ANTON HAGIOS, Chairman, Citizens' Advisory Committee on Highways and Parking to Newark Central Planning Board

IT IS a privilege to act as a discussion leader at this National Citizens' Conference on Planning session which deals with the Newark plan. I bid all the members of the American Planning and Civic Association who have come here from all parts of the country, welcome to our good City. On behalf of the retail merchants and other business interests in the City I express the hope that you will enjoy your three-day visit to Newark and its environs.

Retailing is a more important function than merely buying and selling merchandise. The retailer is vitally interested in planning, particularly as it relates to market development and if you haven't already done so in your respective communities, I would suggest that you make him your ally in bringing your own master plans to reality. You will find the retailer one of your most loyal supporters.

First, let me say that our Master Plan is an exhaustive report on the municipal structure of our City, based on facts procured from official records or actual field surveys, the analyses and recommendations made by professional city planning engineers, the resultant reports studied in detail by citizen's committees of men and women having experience in the particular field upon which they were called to advise, and finally deliberated upon at length by our Planning Board before being officially adopted.

All of us, in our personal lives, and I suppose as an escapist measure, have built dream castles in the air, projected plans out of our own Aladdin's Lamp as the motivating factor, but all of us, except those confined in mental institutions, keep this dream world strictly separate from our everyday life. Experience has proved that the failure to keep the dream world and the practical world properly separated is the reason that so many city plans of the past have failed of accomplishment and have been filed away in municipal archives to gather dust over the years.

We knew this when we started to formulate our plan for a better Newark. The rigid and unfailing yardstick with which we measured every proposal, was the physical and financial ability of the City of Newark to carry out that proposal. We feel we have succeeded in our aim and we hope you will agree. The rest is up to the citizens of Newark, because only the steady and continuous pressure of public opinion can change these plans into brick, mortar, concrete, green grass, and a better City.

The Plan itself is for the physical development of our City and embodies a program for: Housing, Street System, Off-Street Parking, Public Transportation, Truck, Rail, Air and Water Facilities, Parks, Playgrounds, Recreational Facilities & Public Schools, Public Buildings and Lands, Appearance of the City and last, but most important, A Financial Plan by which to carry out the physical improvements.

As business and professional men, you will be interested first in knowing that the Plan is based on a 25-year program, split up into 5-year units in order to keep it sufficiently flexible to meet changing economic and technological conditions.

The estimated overall cost of this plan is $244,176,500. Of this amount, the City of Newark will raise and expend, through the medium of General Bond Issues, $97,732,100, and through Revenue Bonds $35,710,100. Special assessments for particular benefits to private properties would raise $17,596,000. The State and Federal Government will spend $19,540,000 and the County of Essex $11,062,300. With satisfactory evidence that the City intends to rehabilitate itself through the medium of this Master Plan, we are confident that private enterprise can be induced to invest $62,546,000.

Our studies lead us to the conclusion that the expenditure of these monies can be so budgeted that the tax rate can be reduced while the

program is being carried out. This can be done because our present net debt outstanding is $47,995,268, which is being reduced yearly by three to four million dollars as the general obligation bonds fall due and are paid off through our sinking fund. These bonds carry an interest rate of 4¼ percent, and considering a municipal debt of fifty million dollars, for easier computation, interest charges therefore amount to $2,125,000 yearly.

We propose to finance the cost of the Master Plan by re-issuing approximately four million dollars worth of bonds per year for the next 25 years, and, we have been assured by competent financial authorities that the issuance of these bonds for the program as outlined in the Master Plan can be financed at an interest rate of 2 percent or less. Therefore, the saving in interest charges on the first year's issue will amount to $90,000, with the amount increasing yearly until the annual saving on interest charges alone will approximate $1,000,000, which will naturally be reflected in a lower tax rate. In other words, Gentlemen, as we pay off four million dollars worth of bonds on our present debt, carrying an interest rate of 4¼ percent, we will re-issue four million dollars of new bonds with an interest rate of 2 percent or less and the issuance of these bonds will furnish the money to improve the City and make it more attractive for industrial, commercial, and residential purposes, and thereby increase our tax ratables which, of course, will result in a further reduction in the tax rate.

We believe that the Number One Problem in the City of Newark is *Housing*. This includes not only the question of new dwelling units but the abolishing of our slum areas, the rehabilitation of our blighted sections, and a strict zoning law to protect our present adequate residential neighborhoods. We believe that this must be a multi-lateral approach, with,

1. The United States Government, through the Federal Housing Authority, razing certain slum areas and erecting adequate public housing structures.
2. Private enterprise, through the medium of the Preiser Act, which permits a form of municipal subsidy, must be induced to construct adequate low and medium cost housing that will permit the elimination of other slum or blighted municipal cancer areas.
3. Private enterprise and our commuters must be made to realize that the improvements under the Master Plan will make the City of Newark highly desirable for residential purposes and thereby induce them to construct the better and more expensive type of apartment and private dwelling.

This housing program is reasonable and we are convinced that it can be carried out.

Second only to housing, among our municipal ills, is the inadequacy of our street system to handle modern traffic and coupled with this,

the parking problem. Indeed, the impact of motor vehicles on our obsolete street pattern is slowly strangling our central business district, and unless the situation is greatly improved in the near future, will cause business stagnation.

The Highways, Parking and Transit Committee of the Broad Street and Merchants Association was organized because the Board of Directors of the Association felt that the traffic and parking problem was one of the most important confronting the downtown area of the City of Newark as well as the entire metropolitan area of Northern New Jersey, of which Newark is the hub.

I can say without fear of contradiction that the highway and traffic situation of Northern New Jersey is unique in this country, from at least two angles. We have in our area the most heavily traveled traffic artery in the world—Route 25, or U.S. 1, as it is more widely known, originally designed for 35,000 vehicles per day, but actually carrying a peak load in excess of 100,000 cars per day during the heavy shore traffic season.

The Newark traffic problem is unique from a second point of view. Some of our big merchandising establishments in the downtown area do over ⅔ of their business volume with customers residing outside the city limits of Newark. If you consider that these stores do a combined retail volume in excess of $125,000,000, you get some idea of the traffic this retail trade generates daily in the direction of downtown Newark. Even though the area has good mass transportation facilities, we know than 97 percent of all vehicular traffic consists of private motor cars. The dependence of the major downtown retail establishments on the motor car was clearly demonstrated during the early days of the war when gasoline rationing was decreed from Washington. So dependent had the major portion of the customers of these retail establishments become on the use of motor cars that for a while these stores barely managed to hold their own as far as maintaining sales volume was concerned, while retail establishments in most other retail markets in the country went ahead from 30–50 percent over prewar sales. Fortunately for them and for all others who have a stake in this market, our stores gradually overcame this situation, and since the end of the war they have again recovered the leading position they occupied as one of the major consumer markets in this country.

This is one reason for the businessman's interest in the traffic problem. Another is the fact that Newark, as you know, is also New Jersey's industrial hub as well as its commercial and financial center. Its industrial plants and commercial enterprises, including banks and insurance companies, employ thousands of workers, many of whom use cars to get to and from their places of business or employment—creating a heavy traffic flow between and through downtown Newark and its suburban area during morning and evening hours.

There is a third reason which can be summed up under the heading of general economic development of this area. For decades, the North Jersey suburban area has absorbed the major portion of the overflow of New York's population. About twenty years ago, this migration of population trend shifted away from New Jersey and toward Westchester and Long Island. Our consumer market growth is greatly dependent upon this population pipe-line resulting from New York's overflow. The businessman feels that better highways and transportation facilities will reverse this migratory trend or at least enable us to hold our own in competition with Westchester County and Long Island.

The consumer market of our Newark economy alone does over $600,000,000 worth of business. It is a fact not generally appreciated that the Newark area constitutes one of the richest consumer markets in the country, second only to Los Angeles County, which includes the fabulously rich Hollywood movie colony. Newark's consumer market comprises all of Essex County, the western part of Hudson County and the Northern part of Union County. In this area, live over 1,000,000 people.

Since the Northern New Jersey area is greatly influenced by the economic magnet over across the Hudson, all major highway arteries gravitate in the direction of Manhattan Island. A similar situation prevails in South Jersey where all major highway arteries lead to Philadelphia. Previous State Highway Department Administrations built one of the finest highway systems connecting Philadelphia and New York. This was necessary. It also built numerous other arterial highways serving New York and Philadelphia. These, too, were essential for the economic growth of our State. In addition, it built one of the finest state highway systems in the country, blanketing this State from one end to the other. In many instances, it did not run this system through large cities and towns, leaving the construction of these urban connections with the State system up to the local municipalities to complete.

In addition to providing these connections, these built-up urban area centers were also called upon to help defray the major share of the cost of the entire state highway system. Thus Essex County, for instance, contributed since the inception of the State Highway Department, some $160,000,000 in highway resources and received in return about $50,000,000 in the way of state appropriations for local highway improvements. Meanwhile, there has been a substantial shift in our tax structure from local to state and Federal levies, accompanied by a corresponding increase in the essential services of local governments, county and municipal, and what were once considered well-to-do urban centers are no longer in a position to take care of their traffic problems themselves. It has been apparent for some time that Federal and state aid is urgently needed.

This fact has been recognized first by Federal Government and more

recently by State Governments including our own. In fact, our State Highway Commissioner, Spencer Miller, Jr., played a leading part in the formulation of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 which now allocates for the first time, larger Federal funds, matched by equal state funds, for the relief of urban traffic congestion. Essex County's needs which come within the provision of Federal and state aid are primarily two. First and foremost, from a local point of view, is east-west traffic relief, and second from a state-wide point of view, north-south traffic relief. The East-West Freeway for Essex County is expected to remedy our prime problem while the Parkway, Route 4, and Route 100 are planned to help ease our north-south traffic flow.

In this connection I should like to refer you to a study made recently, furnishing statistical proof of what everybody who lives in Essex County knows, that is, that the County's most pressing traffic problem is east-west.

MOTOR VEHICLE TRAVEL TIME—ESSEX COUNTY

Direction	Distance (Miles)	Time Elapsed (Minutes)	Average Driving Rate (Miles PH)
East-West	8.2	50.10	9.8
North-South	11.1	36.5	18.2

It is impossible to discuss Newark's traffic problem without reference to parking. Our Highways, Parking & Transit Committee, headed by Gustave E. Wiedenmayer, Vice-President of the National Newark & Essex Banking Company, has done a good deal of work in promoting a program of creating adequate parking facilities in downtown Newark. Obviously, since our highway program for this area is designed to increase the traffic flow into the downtown area, it will become incumbent upon local authorities to cope with the problem of providing many new and increased off-street parking facilities. In this connection we have suggested the creation of a Parking Authority and we are glad to see that the Central Planning Board has now also taken up the cudgels in favor of this idea. Legislation was passed at the last session and it will go a long way to help Newark and other cities throughout the State to speed up the solution of their parking problem.

The business of our Municipal Government should be the primary business of every resident and worker in the City because, unless we begin the rehabilitation of Newark immediately, the conditions that now *bother* us will eventually *strangle* us, and impair or ruin all business within our boundaries.

Only the continuous pressure of public opinion can carry out such a vast program of re-building. We have made the plans—we are confident that these plans are financially feasible and structurally practical. The rest is up to us, the local business interests and the other citizens and civic workers which make up our Citizens' Advisory Committee to the Central Planning Board.

General Discussion

ROBERT F. FOELLER, Planner, Newark, N. J.

Following the two speakers on "The Newark Plan" a brief discussion period was held. The following questions and answers were given.

(Q) *Harlow O. Whittemore, Ann Harbor, Michigan.*—What percent of the true valuation of property in the City of Newark is the assessed valuation?

(A) *Harry W. Alexander.*—It is very hard to determine the exact percentage due to the inflationary period of the present time, however, there have been properties purchased wherein the percentage of the assessed value was approximately 85 percent of the true value.

Mayor Vincent J. Murphy.—Other over-all percentage would be approximately 65 percent of the true value.

(Q) *Unidentified Lady.*—What percent of private money do you expect to have invested in the development of the Master Plan?

(A) *Harry W. Alexander.*—No definite percentage has been determined but it is estimated that approximately 68 million dollars will be the share of the private developer. The rest will be by the City and public agencies.

(Q) *S. P. Bossart, Erie, Pennsylvania.*—What method has New Jersey for the taking of delinquent properties?

(A) *Mayor Vincent J. Murphy.*—We hold tax delinquent sales periodically on all properties which have been tax delinquent for a two-year period at which time we sell tax certificates for the taxes due. The owner can come in after the sale, within 30 days, and reclaim his property but must pay all liens on the property.

Mr. Bossart and the Mayor continued their comparison of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey tax delinquent set-up which was merely an elaboration and clarification of the procedures in each of the two States.

(Q) *Unidentified Man.*—Will you proceed with slum clearance in the near future?

(A) *Harry W. Alexander.*—We are waiting for adequate legislation for public housing funds so that there will be money available to construct public housing for the lower income groups. Due to the high cost of construction at the present time private enterprise is restricted in

their ability to provide housing but they are making investigations at the present time to determine what can be done in the future when costs become more reasonable. As an example of the high construction cost, the City of Newark recently remodeled some barrack buildings (former Army buildings) for multiple residential use at a cost of approximately $6,000 per dwelling unit which is a sum formerly thought of as adequate to provide a complete single-family structure. Re-location of families in slum clearance areas is practically impossible at the present time because of the absence of any other housing facilities; therefore, construction costs and inability of re-locating families are the biggest obstacles. As soon as they can be remedied the slum clearance program will be carried out.

(Q) *Mr. Angus J. MacNeil, Massachusetts.*—How are you overcoming the external and internal oppositions to the Plan? Who is the "spark plug" that keeps it going?

(A) *Mr. Hagios.*—The best means of overcoming both internal and external opposition is by the provision of good leadership which is drawn from both public and private sources, with members from the City Council and various civic agencies well educated in the various programs in the Plan. With the advice of competent counsel for our Advisory Committees and Plan Commission we are able to present a most favorable picture at various public hearings. The Citizens' Advisory Committee is the "spark plug" of the program. Mr. Burnett and the Planning Board keep them informed.

Mayor Vincent J. Murphy.—There are also legal ways to overcome opposition to the Plan. Under the New Jersey law, once the Master Plan is adopted it then requires a ⅔ vote of the City Commission to overrule the Planning Board on matters pertaining to the Master Plan.

(Q) *Unidentified Man, Hamilton, Ohio.*—Who were the 200 Citizens' Advisory Committee members and how were they selected?

(A) *Mayor Vincent J. Murphy.*—Under the State Law the Planning Board can establish an Advisory Committee whose Chairman is designated by the Mayor. The Chairman shall be responsible for the development of the Committee. In Newark, Franklin Conklin, Jr., was made Chairman of the Advisory Committee and proceeded to get members from all of the civic groups and various employment levels. We have as diversified a membership as we could find. We have members from all churches, various organizations and all sections of the City.

(Q) *Mr. John P. Woolridge, Trenton, New Jersey.*—We have just set up a Planning Commission in Trenton and I am interested in knowing when the best time to set up the Advisory Committee would be?

(A) *Mayor Vincent J. Murphy.*—I would suggest you wait until actual work is begun on your Plan and then appoint your Committee so that the members will be able to see the Plan develop and feel that they are having a part in its development by working on the various

preliminary reports. Before such time as there are actual plans for them to pass on there is no need for the Advisory Committee but they should be activated while the Plan is in progress and not have the completed Plan thrown into their laps without their having a chance to help develop it.

(Q) *Mr. Lee J. Ninde, Fort Wayne, Indiana.*—Are you contemplating the publication of a "school" book, especially designed for school children to present the Master Plan in a language which they can understand?

(A) *Mayor Vincent J. Murphy.*—Yes. The Master Plan, as published, has been distributed in all school libraries, church groups and other places where it will do good in educating the citizens of Newark.

Peter A. Cavicchia, Chairman of the Central Planning Board.—We are very much interested in the subject and would like to print a simple condensation of the official Master Plan in a language especially designed for school children if we are able to obtain funds to do so. We have no funds of our own to print such a report but we are already trying to interest private capital to publish such a book for us.

(Q) *Mr. Edward Connor, Detroit, Michigan.*—Are there staff services provided for the Advisory Committee and, if so, are there any special members of the staff who are under the Committees' direction?

(A) *Mr. Hagios.*—We have a Planning staff of 5 to 6 people who are constantly rendering services and giving information to the different Committees as is necessary, but there is no special staff working directly for the Advisory Committee. However, at various times, special studies have been made at their request.

(Q) *Mr. Robert Kingery, Chicago.*—How is the political organization related to the Plan?

(A) *Mr. Hagios.*—Political organizations are treated in the same manner as church groups, civic groups, schools, libraries, unions, or any other organizations. All groups have been brought in to review the Plan and all groups are sent speakers to "plug" the Plan. We try to show no preference.

No further questions. Meeting adjourned.

PLANNING EDUCATION

CITIZENS' PART IN PLANNING

A Mayor's Planning Committee

J. MITCHELL GARRISON, City Planning Engineer, Manager of Omaha Improvement Commission, Omaha, Nebraska

IT IS with distinct pleasure and honor to me to be able to speak to you tonight on the subject of "A Mayor's Planning Committee." I refer you to the Mayor's City-Wide Planning Committee of the City of Omaha, Nebraska, formulated and appointed by Honorable Mayor Charles W. Leeman, City of Omaha, to put together and formulate Omaha's City-Wide Plan. In this connection, 168 citizens of the City of Omaha were appointed to carry out the various functions of the plan, under the able direction of Russell J. Hopley, as general chairman. Since this time Mr. Hopley received national recognition being appointed to the Office of Secretary of Defense with James Forrestal, in charge of the civilian defense planning program for this Nation.

Under Mr. Hopley's direction three vice-chairmen were set up in charge of the project chairman and the respective committees. These committees consisted of the Auditorium Committee; Municipal Garage, Police and Fire Station; Civic Center and City Hall; Library; Public Market Facilities; Parking down town and suburban; Streets and Boulevards, and Traffic Control Signals; Sanitation; Street Lighting; Grade Crossing Elimination and Viaduct; Bus Transportation Facilities and Armory; Airport and Air Transportation; Parks, Playgrounds and Recreation; River-rail Terminal and River Transportation; Housing and Slum Area Elimination Committees.

A report of these respective committee chairmen was channeled through their vice-chairmen to Mr. Hopley and specific improvements recommended for the City of Omaha. This was done in the fall of 1945 and the spring of 1946 and the reports of the respective committees from the vice-chairman were filtered through a correlating and finance committee who in turn made specific recommendations to the general chairman. In March 22, 1946 the final report and recommendations were submitted to Mayor Charles W. Leeman and at that time the general committee disbanded, their work was complete.

Bear in mind, each project reported upon was thoroughly thought out as to the feasibility not only the feasibility but to the workability of the program and to the financing of that particular project. A complete history of this Mayor's City-Wide Planning Committee will be found on page 289 of Omaha's master plan, more widely known as the "Blue Book of Omaha," under the heading of chronological develop-

ments in connection with the organization of the Mayor's City-Wide Planning Committee. Total cost of the projects recommended to the voters in November 1946 was $14,500,000 and of this amount the voters of the City of Omaha gave their voting O.K. to $12,121,000 in civic improvements of the City of Omaha.

This plan, my dear friends, is in operation and is fast becoming steel, brick, mortar and concrete. It is a citizen's plan and a plan in operation and is actually being accomplished. It isn't just a beautiful picture hanging on the wall or lying in the archives catching dust. We are proud of our plan and the national publicity given us through the medium of *Life Magazine* last July. We are doubly proud of our plan for it is a plan in operation, it is a citizen's plan, a group of the citizens of the City of Omaha formulated the plan, therefore it could not fail; moreover, proof of the pudding has been reiterated in a recent city election where the plan was attacked by opposition. Holders of office in city government that had lost out in previous years in city election before the plan was inaugurated, attacked the plan viciously; again the vote of the people indicated their desire to keep the plan in operation by retaining five of the seven city commissioners that were for the plan.

In Omaha today there are some sixty-odd civic organizations that are backing the plan, organizations that have been reorganized as civic improvement clubs. These organizations are behind the plan fighting for the plan helping us in getting the plan put into operation. The thing I wish to stress to you most is the fact that a plan in operation is absolutely non-political, by this I mean, the fact that the voters saw fit to authorize the appointment of five new city commissions to carry out the plan headed by the over-all commission, namely, the Omaha Improvement Commission, which is charged with the duties of supervising and promoting the plan but whose powers are limited to approving, promoting and supervising the action of other public officials and persons employed thereby so as to assure that the plan will be carried out as recommended. The Omaha Improvement Commission is to approve the selection of architects employed in carrying out the plan, to approve all contracts for work done and carrying out the plan, approve the order in which the various projects of the plan are to be carried out. To approve the retirement of all bonds in connection with the plans and projects thereof.

The success of the Omaha Plan, I firmly believe may be attributed to the fact that the people of the City of Omaha as a whole were given an opportunity to work on the plan to assist in formulating the plan and above all to assist in carrying out the plan through the medium of the five appointed commissions of the citizens of the City of Omaha.

I wish to thank you again for an opportunity to tell you of the Omaha Plan and again I call to your attention, it is a plan in actual operation.

A Brief History of City Planning in St. Louis, and its Success as Related to Citizen Understanding and Support

JOSEPH A. McCLAIN, JR., Chairman, City Plan Commission, St. Louis, Mo.

I WILL direct my remarks to a brief discussion of the history of city planning in St. Louis and its success as related to citizen understanding and support.

First, I should state that I am relatively a freshman in the field of city planning, having served on our Commission for only about three years, and thus cannot speak, as many of you can, from a wealth of experience. I have formed, however, some fairly definite impressions about city planning so far as getting actual concrete results is concerned.

In my opinion, our greatest problem in St. Louis, if our recently projected comprehensive city plan is to be made effective, is to secure full understanding and support of the plan by the public. This is no easy task, as we have already found out, for misunderstandings of terminology and objectives of the plan have brought forth many weird inquiries from the time it was first proposed and published a year ago.

A sympathetic press and radio are very helpful, but this is not enough. I am convinced that we must work upwards from the *grass roots*. I believe that neighborhood or community unit work is basic in any large city, if intelligent and constant support is to be developed for such a plan, which must be interrelated to localities and its benefits to them made clear. I believe that the record of city planning in St. Louis contains several lessons of the necessity of getting public understanding and support before ambitious programs are undertaken.

St. Louis has an unusually long and practically continuous record of city planning activity. Throughout most of the 45 years or so of activity, citizens' associations have played an important role.

In November, 1905, the Civic League of St. Louis appointed a committee to study this subject, and, in 1907, the League published a 150-page, illustrated, well-printed book, entitled "A City Plan for St. Louis." There were plans for streets and highways, transportation, an outer park system, and a civic center. Since no official action was taken on this report, some of the leading citizens recognized the need for a sustained effort, and there was formed a City Plan Association, composed chiefly of business men who subscribed $100 each for membership.

After three years or so of activity, the city government finally was persuaded to undertake city planning work, and an ordinance was passed creating an official City Plan Commission on March 27, 1911. This apparently was the first, or very nearly the first City Plan Commission appointed by any American city. The ordinance authorized

the appointment of a City Plan Commission, and delegated to the Commission the authority to study a wide range of activities, but the Commission's functions were purely advisory. The range of activities were as follows:

First, to prepare a comprehensive city plan for the future improvement, as well as for the commercial development of the city, including recommendations for:
(a) Improvement of the river front;
(b) Extension of streets and the supervision of the opening of sub-divisions;
(c) Improvement of surroundings of Union Station;
(d) A system of widening and opening various through streets so as to make the City more cohesive and less disjointed;
(e) Control of nuisances;
(f) A playground, park and boulevard system;
(g) Location of public buildings;
(h) Encouraging the location of manufacturing establishments in designated districts;
(i) Extension of conduit district for wires;
(j) Extension of granitoid sidewalk districts, and for the regulation of same in the residence districts so as to provide for the planting of trees and for sufficient soil space to assure their growth;
(k) Such other improvements as will tend to make St. Louis a greater and more beautiful city.

Second, to suggest the state and municipal legislation necessary to carry out the recommendations of the Commission.

The officers of this first Commission were C. P. Walbridge, Chairman, and Walter B. Stevens, Secretary, and the membership of the Commission was indeed a cross-section of the citizenship of St. Louis at that time.

There was very little experience to guide the early Commission in its work, and it is quite natural that its activities centered around one or two projects, namely, revival of traffic on the Mississippi river, and the creation of a great parkway, leading from the business district about two miles westwards to some of the best residential areas. In the course of its three-year existence, the Commission published *six valuable* reports:

1. "Establishment of Parks and Parkways"
2. "The River Front—Possible Municipal Ownership of Terminals"
3. "River Des Peres—Establishment of a Sanitary District"
4. "Five Possible Locations and Comparative Cost of Proposed River Terminals"
5. "Municipal Institutions of St. Louis—Where to Go and What to See"
6. "Central Traffic Parkway of Saint Louis"

While the matter of river traffic was not particularly spectacular, the work of this early Commission was of great significance in later years. As a result of the Commission's efforts, the first large concrete dock on the Mississippi river was built at the foot of North Market Street. Barge traffic has brought to this dock a greater annual tonnage of freight than was carried on the Mississippi in the heyday of the legendary, but less efficient side-wheeler steamboat.

The city administration supported the plan for creating a great parkway to the west by taking all of the property between Market

and Chestnut from 12th to Jefferson and all of the property between Lawton and Pine from Jefferson to Grand. This parkway was inspired by similar projects in many European cities known favorably to many of the citizens of this community. An ordinance providing for condemnation of the property was passed by the Board of Aldermen February 9, 1915, but opposition developed and a referendum was invoked. At the election held in June, 1915, the parkway plan was defeated by an overwhelming vote.

Curiously, the opposition to the plan arose from two groups of widely different character. The Taxpayers League opposed the project on the ground of excessive cost. The St. Louis Chapter of the American Institute of Architects opposed the project on the grounds that the city should first have a city plan before launching upon any projects of great magnitude such as the parkway, and on the theory that there might be other projects for which there was greater need.

The City Plan Commission resigned in a body after the election and the city administration felt that the people of St. Louis did not have sufficient interest in city planning to support the commission. The lack of citizen understanding and support thus caused the first set-back to city planning in St. Louis.

At this point a new citizens group was formed by Mr. Luther Ely Smith, an attorney, as Chairman, and with Mr. Eugene S. Klein as secretary. The new organization was called the "Citizen's City Planning Committee" and was enthusiastically supported by a group of younger men in the community as well as quite a few members of the early City Plan Association.

The Citizen's City Planning Committee concluded that the architects had been correct and that what St. Louis needed was a complete and comprehensive city plan. The city administration was prevailed upon to appoint a new City Plan Commission with a new and younger personnel. (Dwight F. Davis was Chairman, and James C. Jones Vice-Chairman of the new Commission, which was appointed in the fall of 1915.) The Association raised some funds and engaged the services of Harland Bartholomew, of Newark, New Jersey, to come to St. Louis as City Planning Engineer. The Association paid all expenses until April, 1916, when the city administration was again persuaded to appropriate funds for a staff, under the direction of Bartholomew, to prepare a comprehensive city plan. Such a plan was prepared in the ensuing three years which covered the period of the first world war. Although several of the members of the Commission, as well as of the Citizen's Association, left to enter the armed services, the work of preparing the comprehensive plan was not seriously interrupted.

In 1918, just prior to the close of the war, the Commission issued a report entitled: "St. Louis After the War," in which there was proposed a long range capital expenditure program for financing the city plan.

The city administration accepted this proposal and a proposed bond issue of $20 million was placed before the voters on May 11, 1920. The voters also rejected this proposal. Numerous explanations were made for the defeat, but the consensus was that the failure was due to absence of citizen support and a certain lack of confidence in the city administration.

Thus, after 20 years of effort, St. Louis had very little in actual accomplishment to show for its activities in the field of city planning. There had been three citizen organizations which conducted aggressive campaigns for a brief time, but they gradually faded into a state of inactivity or became completely defunct. The two occasions on which the city administration had actively sponsored the work resulted in pronounced failure at the polls. Here, then, is a record which evidences the need for sustained and widespread citizen understanding and support of city planning if it is to produce tangible results.

In 1922, at the instigation of members of the former citizen City Planning Association, the Chamber of Commerce and certain other civic bodies, it was agreed that there was great need for public improvements in St. Louis and an even more determined effort should be made to achieve them. There was formed what was known as the Council on Civic Needs, consisting of representatives of organizations throughout the whole city. After innumerable meetings an $87 million bond program was proposed and an election held February 9, 1923. A most aggressive and extensive campaign was conducted under the direction of Frank W. Carter, an attorney, as Chairman. The campaign was successful and the bond issue was approved by an overwhelming majority on all but one of the twenty types of projects proposed. The program called for the issuance of $8 million in bonds a year for a period of 11 years, thus spreading the cost over a 30 year period. Serial bonds were issued which reduced the amount of interest required to a minimum. A citizen's bond supervisory committee was appointed prior to the election which the city administration recognized and agreed should approve all expenditures from the bond proceeds. This achievement pointedly illustrates what can be done when public interest and enthusiasm is aroused by capable and hard-working leadership.

A virtual transformation of St. Louis was made possible by this program. The work of the early years was not lost by any means. It was extremely helpful in having created a background of public understanding of city planning and the desirability of the type of projects proposed. In all of this work the citizen committees played a most important part—without it, progress in St. Louis would unquestionably have been seriously arrested in 1922. Without the aid of citizen committees, city administrations could accomplish little or nothing.

In the late 1920's it was decided to make the Council on Civic Needs a permanent organization to foster and support the City Plan as well

as other desirable phases of municipal development. An annual budget of approximately $40,000 was raised and a small staff organized. The continuous activity of this staff and the regular meetings of the Executive Committee of the Council assure a continuity of program and a constant watch over the well-being of the comprehensive City Plan. The Council on Civic Needs has been a real tower of strength in opposing numerous attacks upon the zoning ordinance.

The Council has been helpful in maintaining citizen membership on the City Plan Commission; some of its members have become members of the Official City Plan Commission and of the zoning Board of Adjustment. The Council must again be reactivated in enthusiastic support of our new plans if we are to make progress in the near future.

Of more recent years there has been a growing recognition of the importance of citizen interest and activity, particularly on the neighborhood level, in the field of city planning. In 1936 our City Plan Commission divided St. Louis into 82 residential neighborhoods and 17 industrial districts and, since that time, has been active in encouraging local organizations to become more familiar with the City Plan as it affects their communities and the city as a whole, as well as to take a greater interest in the work of the Council on Civic Needs.

The Community Fund, subsequently succeeded by the Social Planning Council, has recognized the importance of neighborhood organization in the social and economic fields by encouraging the establishment of community councils in the various neighborhoods of the city. There would appear to be good reason to believe that joint efforts could profitably be undertaken by combining the forces for planning—social, economic, or otherwise—particularly on the neighborhood level.

In 1942 the citizens of St. Louis approved a new bond program of $63 million, the projects to be undertaken being generally similar to those in the 1923 bond issue, *i.e.*, streets, parks, public buildings, etc., but representing new needs to meet the demand of the postwar era. This program would not have been successful without strong citizen support. A special citizen's committee, the City Plan Commission, the city administration and the Council on Civic Needs all worked together in the development of this program and in the campaign leading to its adoption.

From its creation in 1911 until April, 1947, the St. Louis City Plan Commission, while supported by city funds, was purely advisory, and referral of municipal projects to it was not required by ordinance. Although state enabling legislation was lacking, an ordinance was passed in April, 1947, which with some modifications, is patterned after the standard planning legislation now in effect in many States. This ordinance requires referral to the Commission of all public projects, although the Commission's action may be over-ridden by a majority vote of the Board of Aldermen, or of the Board of Public Service, as the case may be.

However, it requires a ⅔ vote of the Aldermen to over-ride the Mayor's veto, which our present Mayor frequently uses in support of the Plan Commission. This ordinance has given the Commission an official status and prestige it did not formerly possess. Our Commission is now in the process of officially adopting, after the requisite public hearings, various parts of the comprehensive City Plan which it proposed and published in the early part of 1947.

The City Plan Commission now maintains on its staff one person who devotes a substantial part of his time to working with neighborhood organizations, and whose duties are to see that generally the public is informed, and its interest sought to be enlisted in city planning. This we believe to be a relatively new but extremely important phase of successful city planning achievement. It holds promise so far as our staff's efforts are concerned of far greater and more successful city planning work than has heretofore been visualized. Nevertheless, I believe that regardless of how much effort our Commission and staff make to secure public support, we sorely need the assistance of civic leadership and lay groups, who do not claim to possess technical capacity, but who consistently support and interpret to the public the soundness of city planning and urge action to carry it into effect. Without such support our new comprehensive plan will not be translated from paper into reality.

A Permanent Citizens Council on Planning

GRANVILLE W. MOORE, Vice President and Exec. Dir., Greater Dallas Planning Council, Dallas, Texas

THERE seems to be present here this evening the spirit of the past. One hundred and sixty-one years ago, leaders of the several communities and States gathered together to write the Constitution of the United States of America, yet we are a young Nation. The passage of time is relative. If we but count events and the sacrifices some have made to achieve the eminence we, as a Nation, now hold, it has been a long, long time since New Jersey's illustrious delegate, William Paterson, presented the New Jersey plan to the Federal Convention assembled in Philadelphia in 1787. Paterson then thought, as many of us in 1948, now believe, that there is much at stake in the possibility of ever advancing encroachments of the Federal Government. (This is not intended as a brief on States Rights, the present Civil Rights Issue, nor the Tidelands Case.) While Paterson and his fellow delegates believed primarily in strong local government, he also recognized the need and the value of a strong and binding instrument of unity that would endure. Let us examine the phraseology of the Constitution to which he subscribed. I quote the Preamble:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

From this quotation, it can readily be seen that he, too, sought permanence, for you will particularly note in the Preamble the reference "and our Posterity." What other meaning could the expression "Posterity" have other than denoting *Continuing* or *Permanence?*

We, too, who are assembled here this evening, in search of ways and means of making our respective cities better places in which to live, work, and play, dedicate our thoughts and efforts to perpetuating "the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity." By seeking to secure them, not only for ourselves, but for "our Posterity," we give to our objectives the essence of permanence and find ourselves not unlike our founding Forefathers. If we would attain our goal, we must be willing to fight for it—not in the sense of offering armed combat, but in intelligent work and in our willingness not to permit fundamentals to be sacrificed when emotions and pressure groups pose conflicts either by action or indifference contradictory to the comprehensive welfare of the people as a community.

Determined, but unbiased and practical leadership, buttressed by more than professional know-how, is necessary. I aspire to no mark of distinction as a moralist when I make this statement. City and community planning is more than the end product of the Engineer's and Architect's slide rule, T-square, and angle. It must contain honesty of intention to solve an environmental problem, based upon the morality of the highest principles. Unless it does, how can a citizenship loyally support it; unless it does, how can the plan offer accumulative benefits? It must, of necessity, have an element of stability and permanence. It must not only solve problems created by the lack of planning, but it must be so designed as to offer a pattern which the citizenship may constructively follow, and in doing so, provide for themselves and their posterity, the benefits of both social and economic improvement. But even with all the desirable factors, proportionately balanced upon a mechanical, moral and esthetic foundation, we as a people, human beings with all our frailties, being what we are, we must be reminded, reminded and re-minded. This, apparently, is equally true both in official as well as in private life.

Hence our civic leaders, whatever field may engage their private activity must, as a community obligation, sacred to themselves and to their posterity, step forward, lighting the way. If we are to make consistent progress in planning, we must keep the light trimmed and burning constantly or else we lose all of the ground we may have gained. The cost increases by whatever unit it may be measured. Sometimes this cost is prohibitive. This is why citizen participation in planning is

so necessary, but even more, why our great civic leaders, in public or private life alike, must give of their time and talents in organizing and supporting citizen activity upon a basis of permanence.

We, in Dallas, while a young and inexperienced citizen organization, believe in this procedure. We *now* know, from and by experience, that great plans of the past have either died aborning or have failed to accumulatively grow. These hopeful plans were either abandoned on the doorstep by changing political administrations, or expired by just plain citizenship indifference. Mainly, I think this apparent indifference could be traced to the lack of proper citizen understanding. The element of education that citizens' organizations can and should provide was lacking.

This need of education, aside from our own personal experience, has been most effectively brought to our attention by the continuous work as reflected by the membership of various professional groups and, more particularly, the American Planning and Civic Association, through the wise leadership of its officers and directors. It has been a lasting balm to our pride that Dallas was chosen as the host city to the American Planning and Civic Association in the spring of 1946. We shall long cherish this memory—a memory of pleasant association—a memory when we were able to learn from others more experienced, yet willing to share with us. This assembly of professional and public spirited laymen, notable because of their achievements, was an inspiration to us. Exemplary evidence of planned development in other cities was most challenging. We have attempted to profit by this rare opportunity and we believe we are making some progress. It is possible that we in Dallas are braggarts—a trait sometimes charged, and amiably accepted by Texans, both native and adopted. I prefer, however, in all humility, to say we are *proud.* We are justifiably proud of our city, even with a'l its faults. We are devotedly proud of our people; we are humbly proud of the faith of our citizenship—but we are not satisfied.

Since most of you are familiar with the enviable record of activities of the American Planning and Civic Association, you also know that Dallas has a Master Plan. The need for such a plan was conceived by our civic leaders and City Council in the early 40's. The Master Plan for Greater Dallas was capably drawn by Harland Bartholomew and Associates. In laying out a pattern for Dallas 25 years hence, Mr. Bartholomew, very wisely, combined the human element with technological facts. This was accomplished by tedious hours spent with various groups, meticulously explaining each segment of the Plan. Obviously, this procedure had, in itself, the essence of permanency. I shall not further dwell on the details, the manner in which it was drawn, nor the many peculiar problems which we encountered. We do believe, however, we can, by unity of purpose and by continuity of effort, follow our Master Plan, as provided in the Master Plan, modifying or amend-

ing it from time to time as circumstances may warrant, making not only the City of Dallas a finer and more useful city, but by building upon a foundation of permanence, helping to build a truly greater area or region.

The Greater Dallas Planning Council, chartered by the State of Texas as a non-profit corporation, is a citizen organization. Its membership of 200 Advisory Board members represents every area of Metropolitan Dallas as well as every stratum of its citizenship, and therefore forms the base structure. The Greater Dallas Planning Council began its official life January 1, 1947. It came into being under the able leadership of our former Mayor, and now a member of the American Planning and Civic Association directorate, the Honorable J. Woodall Rodgers. So you see, we are yet young and inexperienced. Our efforts of the first year, under the direction of a 15-member Board of Directors and its officers, all of whom serve without compensation, were channeled toward building the soundest possible foundation so necessary to perpetuate the life of our Planning Council. Now, beginning our second year, under the very capable and experienced leadership of Mr. Paul Carrington, our President, who has asked that I extend his sincere regrets for his inability to be present, and in whose place I am appearing on the program, our definite program is taking shape and form. Our program contemplates permanence. By this, I refer to that portion pertaining to the establishment of a Bureau of Municipal and Governmental Research.

Our plans are that this shall be a continuing supplement to our planning activities. We believe it to be our duty to constantly make unbiased studies of local government relating to all of its phases and to make public our findings. Accurately informing the public is the highest form of public service contributing to the welfare and progress of a Democracy. While of necessity, the growing problems of our cities will necessitate certain current adjustments, we subscribe, and hopefully, to the theory that recurring problems require factual study and reporting. Intelligent research conducted consistently, actually forms the foundation for sound planning. One example of recurring problems is the study and analysis of municipal finances, of county finances and a factual comparison of the two. We are intensely concerned in the correlation of the various units of local government. Also, objectivity is, we believe, a definite requirement if permanence is to be an accumulative goal. In order clearly to make this particular point, I quote from the provisions of our Charter:

> The purposes for which the corporation is formed are educational, charitable, and civic; that is to say, this corporation is formed to study, foster, encourage, and safeguard a comprehensive Master Plan of public improvements for the metropolitan area of Greater Dallas; to confer with and render assistance to and make recommendations to the public officials having to do with carrying out any part of such a Master Plan; and to make recommendations and act upon any other matter which may be deemed to affect the welfare of the metropolitan area of Greater Dallas. This corporation shall be entirely non-political in character.

I think it important to re-state, "This corporation shall be entirely non-political in character." It is, therefore, obvious that the Greater Dallas Planning Council is non-political. It bears no part in any municipal election and does not attempt to dictate any political appointments. Its Advisory Board is elected from year to year by the membership and this Board, in turn, elects Directors. The Directors elect officers annually. We conscientiously believe that it is our obligation not to permit city planning to languish or fail, since the whole future of our city and its effect upon the surrounding area is dependent upon intelligent and consistent action toward working out this vitally important program. To hold these accruing benefits, we must work and build as realists, yet in an atmosphere of practicability, based upon a permanent foundation. We have a Master Plan. We very humbly propose, by research and application, to achieve a constantly analyzed and improved plan for our metropolitan area. The campaign in which our citizenship is enlisted, like life itself, is a continuing march toward that illusive goal of perfection. There can be no faltering—no surrendering.

Unlike a great novel or a scintillating opera, in citizenship participation in planning there can be no thrilling climax. True, the play must go on. Each day and each year there must be a repeat performance, with all the accumulated improvements reflected either in the cast or in the staging. The contribution of each citizen, a star in his or her own right, becomes the means by which Posterity shall reap the benefits, and it, too, shall pass its contribution along the endless chain of evolution.

Planning for a better civilization, actively working with the problems with a fervent hope that the future will be the better for our having participated, is truly a magnificent life—and let us, therefore, hope that the results of our labors will amply justify the words of the great novelist, H. G. Wells, who wrote:

> But who can tell of the fullness and pleasure of life; who can number all our new cities, cities made by loving hands of man for living men; cities men weep to enter, so fair they are, so gracious, so kind.

Eternal Citizen Vigilance is the Price of Planning

CLIFFORD A. RANDALL, presented by MAYNARD W. MEYER, Milwaukee, Wis.

THERE is much discussion these days about the American city. What is being said amounts practically to a din, and it is not pretty to hear.

I can remember the days when the American city was the toast of our young land, when it was proclaimed as the focal point of our country's surge to an eminent position among the rest of the Nations of the world. The Americans were builders then, and they were building a new world, free from the corroding influences, the enervation that hobbled progress in other lands. The American city, with its capacity for industry, for recreation, for culture, was extolled then as a powerful force in these strides of progress. It was a glowing testimonial to a happier, better life.

Today, however, we hear a different story.

We are told at every turn that the American city is disintegrating, that it is falling apart at the seams. We are told that it is deteriorating, that its population is heading for the clean, open spaces of the suburb, that it is retreating to ever narrower boundaries. We are told that it breeds crime and disease, that its tax rate is increasing year by year, that its services, even with a mounting tax rate, are not what they used to be. We are told that the American city, once the pride of our Nation, has grown shabby, that it is now a hollow shell. The American city, we are told, has seen its day.

Merely to scoff at these charges would be unwise indeed. Some of the charges which are being levelled at the city are unfortunately true. Some are merely half-truths, statements to be recognized only for what they are worth. Some are merely idle assertions, based on scant information and not nearly so dangerous as they sound.

Whatever the merit of the specific charges, however, it is obvious that life in our cities is not what it could be.

Most of us are city-dwellers. We are all interested in better cities and in a better life for those who live in cities. We are all ready to do our part in improving our cities so that in the future there will be absolutely no basis for such charges. That is why most of us are here today.

A year ago most of us met in Milwaukee to discuss the problem of the city and to devise ways to solve these problems. We exchanged ideas, we talked of the things we were doing in our own back yard, we picked up new ideas and we went home to do something with them. I think it can safely be said from that point of view that the 1947 conference in Milwaukee was a resounding success.

The 1947 conference was a sound stimulus to public thought on metropolitan problems. Some of the country's best minds on local planning highlighted the discussion of problems facing modern big

cities and suggested what can be done to cope with them. The convention brought the problems home to Milwaukee in terms that its citizens could easily understand. They looked once again at their city, more closely and more intently than ever before, and they saw serious, disturbing problems. They examined the suggestions that were offered and they applied them to their city. They saw that the suggested solutions *could* work and they resolved then and there to make them work.

Whatever has happened in Milwaukee since the 1947 conference there is ample evidence of the value of conferences like this. What has happened since 1947 is a triumph in planning, in planning for the future. But it is also a triumph of planning bolstered and complemented by vigorous action.

Before that 1947 conference, Milwaukee was confronted with three major, pressing problems. It lacked adequate housing, blight was spreading, and traffic congestion was becoming ever-more stifling. Estimates of the housing shortage indicated that the city was in immediate need of at least 20,000 new homes. A survey showed that 15 percent of the city's area was blighted and that 25 percent of the city's population lived in those blighted areas. There was no room downtown and in important neighborhood shopping districts for motorists to park their cars. Exactly 42.5 percent of the total parking space in the downtown area, as a matter of fact, was forbidden territory for the motorist. And driving on Milwaukee's streets was no lark either. Traffic was slow, expensive, and relatively unsafe. And it was irksome, to say the least.

Just about a month ago, however, Milwaukee had an election and by referendum it voted to make a large-sized dent in the housing shortage, to do something to check the spread of blight, and to remedy its traffic difficulties. The city voted to issue bonds—and that in itself was a drastic step since Milwaukee has been a pay-as-you-go city since 1932—to make these improvements; it voted $3,500,000 for housing, $2,500,000 for blight elimination, $2,000,000 for offstreet parking facilities, and $5,000,000 to start a system of expressways that will be the hub of a really efficient citywide traffic network.

The 1947 planning conference cannot, of course, take all the credit for the progressive strides Milwaukee is preparing to make. Those strides were a long time developing. Plans for housing had been debated since the end of World War II and even before. Expressways had been argued heatedly ever since a 1946 traffic survey recommended them as the solution to the city's traffic troubles. Blight elimination and offstreet parking had been studied and planned to the same degree.

But the planning conference can justly claim at least a share of the credit for focussing the attention of Mr. and Mrs. Milwaukee on their city's needs and what could be done to remedy them. It showed that the plans that had been recommended for Milwaukee were based upon sound, constructive thinking, that what had been recommended for

Milwaukee's future was not starry-eyed nor visionary, but was eminently in step with forward-looking planning all over the country. The planners had the city's confidence.

The conference followed hard on the heels of a new Metropolitan Master Plan, which was submitted for the approval of Mr. and Mrs. Milwaukee in January of 1947. For a long time Milwaukee had drifted. It made improvements here, and it made them there, but even though its planning staff had been in operation since 1915, Milwaukee still, up until the time the Master Plan was introduced, had no unified, comprehensive guide from which it could develop as a city should and must develop if it is to prosper. The Master Plan supplied the unity and integration that had been missing from the Milwaukee scene. Milwaukee would no longer proceed blindly, but according to a map, and according to a scale of values. Things were put in their proper place and only the big things, the most necessary things, the most important things were to be done first.

But the Master Plan had to have the confidence and support of the people, and the planners at the conference helped make that public backing possible. The planners emphasized the need for a fundamental planning guide, and gave hearty praise to Milwaukee's working model. They applauded the suggested six-year priority programs for refurbishing life in Milwaukee, for the improvement of the Civic Center, for the establishment of parking areas both downtown and at important neighborhood shopping districts, for building an inspiring front yard for the downtown area along Milwaukee's beautiful lake shore, for providing new major cross-town traffic arteries and improving existing streets and intersections, for relocating the city's commission row which has developed into a traffic bottleneck, for building a new Union Station, for beautification of the river front, for a new stadium, for annexation, and for a score of other worthy improvements. The backing of the planners reawakened the attention of Milwaukee's citizens to the need for planning. Milwaukeeans were reassured that their own planners were in step with what is being done all over the country, that planning in Milwaukee was doing at least as well as planning in most other cities.

The conference helped convince Milwaukeeans of the value of planning as an important function of city government. It helped sell planning to the people and that job of sales is worth any effort. With the solid support of the people behind them, the sound, constructive plans that are detailed are that much more certain of ultimate success. And what, after all, are paper plans unless they reach the stage of concrete, steel, and the necessary open spaces.

Planning has now grown up. It is no longer looked upon as the product of visionary dreamers. It has its feet on the ground. Conferences like this, and like the meeting in Milwaukee last year, can emphasize that with telling effect. Take Milwaukee, for example. Planning

was in its infancy there in 1915, but it is now approaching maturity. While formerly the demands made on the planning staff were comparatively light, they have now grown to burdensome proportions. The city has recognized that the planning staff must be accepted for what it is worth, that it must be drawn into all functions undertaken by the city administration so that there will be uniformity and smoothness at every turn. The city has recognized that if the planning is wrong, then everything is wrong. And for that reason—*planning*, planning departments must be accepted on an equal footing with other major city agencies.

Since the last convention, planning in Milwaukee has approached the equal footing that it must have if it is to do its job well. Milwaukee now has a new, youthful mayor and his inaugural address emphasized the need for co-ordinated planning. The mayor said:

> Good city government depends on sound and coordinated planning in all departments of municipal government. Good planning, however, must not result in inaction or deadlocks. The chief executive, the legislative body, and administrative departments, bureaus, boards and commissions, must show teamwork and unity in planning.

To that end, the mayor indicated that he would request the planning department to assign a staff member to attend meetings on city policy and that he would have a member of his own office participate actively in planning staff conferences. This surely is constructive thinking and it indicates once again that planning has at last come into its own.

Interest in planning for a better city is by no means restricted to mayors and city departments and official planning staffs. That interest has spread to private citizens and civic-minded groups who are doing what they can to chart a course of progress for their city. That too became evident at last year's conference.

The 1948 Corporation, a group of civic-minded business and industrial leaders who are doing their best to improve Milwaukee, has taken an active interest in city planning. And they are doing their best to show what planning, bolstered by vigorous action, can do. As part of their campaign for a better city, the Corporation prepared a scale model of Milwaukee's downtown area of the future. The Master Plan was the working, practical plan. The Central Area model was the visionary plan, the dream of the future. And it was meant to be just that. It was designed to impress Milwaukee with the fact that a bold, new approach is needed to solve the ever increasing problems with which it is faced, to show Milwaukee that modern city living calls for freedom of movement, easing of congestion and ample light, air and sunshine. It sought to illustrate what the Milwaukee of tomorrow could be like, though perhaps on a more limited scale, if Milwaukee itself had the *will* to make that kind of city possible.

The model was exhibited after the conference and it stirred up considerable comment. Milwaukee began to develop a new trend of think-

ing, away from negative ultra-conservatism and toward a positive planned action campaign of modern civic aggressiveness. While the planners at the convention were talking of the utility of expressways and of the need for blight elimination and offstreet parking facilities, Milwaukeeans were seeing these things in miniature on the downtown area model.

They saw highly developed east-west and north-south traffic arteries, they saw a harbor that was developed for ocean trade, they saw a completed civic center, they saw a completed downtown airport on the lake front with facilities for seaplanes and helicopters, they saw Milwaukee's world renowned "Gemütlichkeit" recaptured in beer gardens along the river near city hall. They saw Milwaukee as a really modern city, a city that would serve its citizens to the best of its ability.

All the plans in the world, however, will not build a better city. The plans must result in action. And the people must make sure they do result in action. They must have the will to transform the plans into broad, new thoroughfares that will make traffic efficient, safe and economical, into bright, new areas free from the dirt, the disease and the shabbiness of blight. Planning conferences help clear the way. They point out the city's problems. They show what is wrong and what must be done. And they urge that what must be done, be done quickly.

Since the 1947 conference, those things are being done in Milwaukee. A resolution has already been introduced in the city council to issue bonds for large-scale permanent low-cost housing projects. Plans are now being readied for the first segment of a system of expressways that will be the basis of an integrated, comprehensive, time-saving traffic system. Studies are now determining what blighted areas will be cleared first.

All this is the result of renewed confidence in Milwaukee's planners and their plans for making Milwaukee a better, happier city. The 1947 planning conference helped build that confidence. It helped show Milwaukee how it could be a better city. That alone is ample evidence that planning is doing its part and doing it well.

Newark Citizens Study the Plan

JOHN R. BURNETT, Exec. Secy., Central Planning Board, Newark, N. J.

THE Central Planning Board of Newark, New Jersey, adopted a "Master Plan" for the physical development of the City, on July 10, 1947, under the powers granted to it by the State of New Jersey in the "Municipal Planning Enabling Act," as recorded in the Revised Statutes 40:55-1 to 40:55-21.

There was no ceremony connected with the act of adoption. No radio; no bands playing; no flash bulbs; no interested citizen audience. Just a quiet meeting of the planning board—a brief statement by the chairman that sectional reports and studies on the "Master Plan" were complete—a motion by a board member to adopt the series of individual reports as "The Official Master Plan"—a second—a recorded vote—*and* the City of Newark was bound by an official document that is a printed guide to the future for a city proper of half a million people and a metropolitan area housing an additional million.

The lack of interest was disturbing to all of us present on that occasion and *rightly so* because Newark once before had a "Master Plan" worked out by a capable Planning Board and technically supervised by the same man who directed the present plan—Harland Bartholomew. That previous plan was buried in the archives of the city within a short time after its adoption *in 1913*. The present plan has a state law behind it that prevents the administrative body from circumventing it as easily as the 1913 Plan was sidetracked. However, the present plan projects an improvement program that will take twenty-five years to complete and contemplates an expenditure of a quarter of a billion dollars, and only a united and militant civic body can protect, and compel the execution of, such a plan.

It took the combined efforts of more than two hundred men and women, over a four year period, to evolve our new "Master Plan" and it cost approximately one hundred and sixty thousand dollars. The local papers had given wide and faithful coverage to every action of our planning groups during this time and editorial comment had been frequent and favorable. Still, the public reaction on the adoption of the plan was less than that occasioned by the arrival of a movie star at our airport, a frequent occurrence in this city. Why the public apathy? What are the answers?

Frankly, we didn't know—but we immediately went to work to find out. Our Mayor, Vincent J. Murphy, creator of the Planning Board and its greatest driving force, has consistently maintained that civic pride is an absolute necessity to civic improvement. The lack of public interest on the adoption of the "Master Plan" made it apparent that this premise of Mayor Murphy must be our starting point, *if* we were to see this "Master Plan" transmuted to brick and mortar.

Our problem thus became the humanizing of the *Plan* itself. Now city planning is an abstruse subject. It is too dry and too technical for popular appeal. It is, largely, an opinion study because it forecasts future happenings and therefore, must be taken on faith. It is a relatively new profession, although based on centuries of experience, and, as yet, it is not fully established and accepted by even its own trained practitioners. It has swung from the weird theories of the *The City Beautiful* to the hard-headed, business approach of budget-controlled development. In short, the general public look on city planning with suspicion, or cynicism, or as attempted regimentation. At least, that is what we found in Newark.

We realized that selling our *Master Plan* to the people was going to be even a bigger job than developing it and that the wrong approach could do irretrievable harm. But the men and women who worked out the *Plan* have a complete and abiding faith in it and a genuine love for their city. Therefore, the consensus was that an indoctrination program be undertaken to bring the *Plan* to the people, in their own neighborhoods; and explain to them what the plan would mean in better living and better working conditions to each of them, and to their families and friends.

Our publicity director was empowered to set up such a program, on a conservative scale and, to borrow a military phrase, "Proceed with Caution."

The method chosen was a combination of lecture-forum meetings with civic-minded groups, particularly parent-teachers associations; and radio talks, of a friendly and informal nature, beamed into our school rooms over the radio station network of the Newark Board of Education.

The radio program consisted of fifteen weekly talks, in a progression series, and we are confident that it has been a successful undertaking because of the numbers of students who have written into the planning board offices for printed material and the answer to that age-old cry of youth "What are we waiting for? Why don't we do these things NOW?"

The lecture-forum meetings were a different story. Here we had no ready-made audience; less receptive minds; and a cynical reception. Our first attempts were planned to limit the discussion on the over-all plan to thirty minutes; then discuss its application to the particular neighborhood for fifteen minutes; and then throw the meeting open to a forum discussion. The entire lecture to be as calm and dignified as possible and the forum restricted to planning problems only. We found audience response perfunctory and the forum period personally embarrassing to our speakers because of the long wait between questions and the consequent *fifth wheel* feeling that pervades meeting when the interest falls flat.

We experimented by introducing visual aids in the form of charts

and maps and by using them freely cut the discussion on the entire plan to fifteen minutes and increased the period of discussion on the neighborhood effect of the *Plan* to thirty minutes. This method met with much better audience reaction but was still not what we were looking for. So, with much fear and trepidation, we tried two more changes. We departed from the strictly dignified approach and added shock-impact statements to describe actual conditions and we also started to answer forum-questions on administration. We had found the answer—the lecture period was still, of necessity, restricted to forty-five minutes but the forum periods ran well over an hour, sometimes two, and "everybody got in the act."

To date we have held eighty-nine lecture-forum meetings and have, during them, explained the " Plan" to approximately twenty thousand people. Invitations to address all types of organizations have poured in to the Planning Board offices, but the program now coming to a close is an inaugural one and we are ending this phase on June 16. We have learned how to interest our Newark citizens and when we start again, after the summer, because air-cooled movies, the radio, the shore and the mountains, are too much competition for any type of public meeting, we will go all out in a drive to reach every man and woman in this city. We are going to arrange meetings wherever possible; private homes; clubs; churches; schools; everywhere and anywhere. Now that we know we can make the package attractive we are going after volume distribution.

We will tie-in all of the accepted means of advertising with our next phase because we now know that it will not be a waste of money and time. Even the most eye-arresting advertising fails of its purpose if the subject is remote from daily habit and desire. Our inaugural, or indoctrination, program, we believe, has removed this possibility as it relates to *our* citizens and the *Master Plan.* Store windows; exhibits, wherever possible; radio; television; billboards; newspaper ads; all will be called into play to help Newarks' citizens study the "Official Master Plan" that will, when carried out, make Newark a better place in which to live, and a better place in which to work.

There is no doubt in our minds today that "Civic Pride is an absolute necessity to civic improvement" and that "Public needs are human needs." The realization that the individual is the only indispensable component of the body politic and meeting him at his own level, *whatever* it may be, and in his own neighborhood, *wherever* it may be is the secret that should open the door to a better and more prosperous future for the City of Newark because it has been the major reason that is making the "Newark citizen study the Plan."

Round Table on Citizens Organizations for Community Planning

PANEL: KENNETH P. VINSEL, Louisville Area Devel. Assn., *Chairman;* PARK H. MARTIN, Allegheny Conf. on Community Devel. and EDWARD D. CONNOR, Detroit Citizens Housing and Planning Council, *Reporters;* H. S. BUTTENHEIM, American City; FREDERICK T. ROPE, N. Y. State Citizens' Council; FREDERICK P. CLARK, N. Y. Regional Plan Assn.; S. B. ZISMAN, Phila. Citizens Council on City Planning; MRS. FREDERICK T. KUSER, N. J. Citizens Conf.; MRS. W. H. WELLS, Washington, D. C. Citizens' Council for Community Planning; T. T. McCROSKY, Greater Boston Devel. Com.; LEE J. NINDE, Ft. Wayne (Ind.) Civic Assn.; MRS. DUANE L. PETERSON, Baltimore Women's Civic League; WALLACE RICHARDS, Pittsburgh Regional Planning Assn.; GRANVILLE W. MOORE, Greater Dallas Planning Council; JOHN WILKIE, Poughkeepsie Area Devel. Asso.

THE attendance of the panel members at the two sessions held for discussion of the subject, Citizens Organizations for Community Planning, was exceptionally good. Of the fifteen members, including the chairman, twelve attended both sessions, two one session, leaving only two who did not attend. This fine record indicates the interest the subject holds for many persons. Further evidence of such interest was manifest in the large attendance at the panel meeting by persons not on the panel.

In calling the panel to order, the chairman stated that he had written to each member for suggestions as to topics for discussion under the subject heading. As a result of suggestions received, he presented an outline to be followed to keep the discussion objective. So that the outline may be available for future reference, its reproduction follows:

I. *Relationship of National and State Organizations to Local Planning Organizations.*
 1. General purposes and functions of community planning organizations
 2. Services needed and available from national and state organizations
 a. Clearing houses for experiences
 b. Sources of information
 c. Education for planning
 d. Coordination of efforts
 e. Assistance in organizing
 f. Leadership training

II. *Local Citizens Organizations*
 1. Scope and functions:
 a. Planning only
 b. Follow-through and promotion after planning
 c. Union of existing organizations or special interest orgauizations
 d. Relation to neighborhoods and communities
 e. Legislation
 f. Relation to political bodies
 2. Organization
 a. Neighborhood—city—metropolitan—regional
 b. Memberships
 c. Officers—control
 d. Determination of policies
 3. Financing
 a. Large or small contributions
 b. Governmental contributions
 c. Foundation support
 d. Tax deductions
 e. Budgets

4. Public Relations
 a. Publicity
 b. Radio
 c. Speakers
 d. Mass meetings
 e. Movies
 f. Exhibits
 g. Publications
 h. Neighborhood meetings
 i. Schools

Under the heading of Relationship of National and State Organizations to Local Planning Organizations, there was discussion on what is meant by the term "planning." The discussion indicated agreement that planning could be divided into two classifications—Project Planning and Technical Planning.

The part of community organizations in planning received considerable attention. Attention was directed to what part state planning organizations should play in assisting local community planning groups. The several representatives of state organizations on the panel discussed the procedure being followed in their States. The general policy being followed is to give counsel and assistance in local planning but doing no detailed planning for any community. However, one representative of an official state planning body of a southern State said that his official state planning agency not only offered counsel and advice but provided technical service for small communities with those communities participating in the cost. Where States supply leadership only, this is done by means of bulletins, conferences, and field contacts. It was evident that the viewpoint of the representatives of state planning groups favored state planning agencies stimulating citizen participation in the planning process. The services that state and national organizations can render to local organizations seemed by common consent to consist of:

Institutes where professional planners and citizens get together.
Stimulation of interest in planning in smaller communities by literature, conferences, and field contacts.

There was also discussion of the value of national organizations to cities and towns, and as to whether or not there was duplication in the efforts of some of the national organizations. A round-table expression from the panel members indicated about an even division of thinking as to the value of national organizations to local organizations, and a somewhat closer agreement that there is a tendency toward duplication in the efforts of some national organizations.

Under the subject of "Local Citizens Organizations," each panel member described his organization, its method of operation, and financing. The discussion developed the fact that in most larger cities smaller compact organizations with specialized membership and leadership prevailed. In a few large communities, and to a greater extent in smaller

communities, the citizen organizations followed the pattern of either large citizen membership or organization set-ups similar to a federation of agencies. It was also clear that the broader the membership, the greater the problem of financing.

There were two schools of thought on the panel as to the best method of having "citizen participation" in planning—"from the top down, or from the bottom up." One member of the panel who believes strongly in the principle of planning "from the bottom up" stated that in his opinion, this issue would have to be joined. Another panel member expressed the opinion that both processes are needed and should be joined.

The degree of citizen participation was also discussed. There seemed to be agreement that citizen participation would fall in the categories of making, selling, and choice of plans. It was suggested that a new term is needed to replace the term "citizen participation." There was no opposition expressed to this thought.

There was general agreement that a study is needed of community planning organizations. Chairman Vinsel appointed a committee from the panel to prepare a document embodying this proposal. The committee consisting of Harold S. Buttenheim, McKim Norton, S. B. Zinsman, Mrs. W. H. Wells, Park H. Martin, and Edward D. Connor, chairman, presented the following resolution to the President and Secretary of the American Planning and Civic Association:

That the American Planning and Civic Association, itself or in conjunction with other national organizations interested in community planning and development, prepare and publish a study of types of Citizens Community Planning and Action Organizations, their organization structure, techniques of leadership discovery, and citizen participation, financing, methods of determining policy, membership eligibility, and such other factors that relate to the functioning of citizen organizations.

That, at the next major meeting of the Planning Conference of the American Planning and Civic Association, a full day's program be devoted to a presentation and discussion of citizen organizations in planning, including papers presented by speakers from typical citizen organizations in the planning and community development field; and that there also be presentations of techniques in securing expressions of public opinion on planning, and techniques on selling, advertising, and securing public participation, from experts in the above respective fields.

Round Table on Planning Education for Citizens

PANEL: Philip H. Elwood, Iowa State College, *Chairman;* H. O. Whittemore, University of Michigan; E. S. Burdell, Cooper Union; H. A. Merrill, National Capital Park and Planning Committee; J. A. Parker, University of North Carolina; E. B. Wilkins, Rutgers University; F. Shurtleff, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
George J. Albrecht, New York State College of Forestry, *Reporter.*

THE Chairman, as a prelude to the discussion, reviewed the information presented at the 1947 meeting in Milwaukee. He pointed out that the four resolutions of that panel were still partially fulfilled goals and that a report on related activity would be a progressive step for the present meeting. The resolutions covered the introduction and development of planning courses in grade schools and universities and the need for a modern planning primer for both pupils and teachers.

Mr. Whittemore discussed the educational work other than professional training with which he is connected in Michigan. He and his colleagues plan their activities to reach four groups: 1. Planners and Commissions, 2. Community groups interested in planning, 3. The college group, 4. The pre-college group. Four distinct methods have been used to reach each of these.

A direct approach to the first group was through an Institute at the University of Michigan sponsored by the State Planning Board. This was considered a beneficial and successful effort which attracted non-technical people primarily and created a new interest in planning throughout the State.

Secondly, eight meetings were held throughout the State to reach the general public and were titled Home Planning Institutes to develop interest in the problems of "Home and the Community." Attendance varied from 30 to 1100 people, but the benefits were not obvious.

Third, popular courses given in the colleges seemed to have the least influence of all the efforts. They were not required courses in any curriculum and students registered mainly to secure the class credits.

Lastly, several methods were used to reach the public school pupils. These were a powerful influence on an active parkway project in the State. Talks to the children and an essay contest brought the planning problems into the home as well as the school.

Mr. Merrill pointed out that citizens' interest in planning might have saved the National Research Planning Board. He has five suggestions to overcome that lack of interest. 1. Case studies of planning problems could be prepared and published for general distribution. 2. Technical students of planning need to know the operation of citizens groups as well as the approach to and methods of planning. The most effective work might be done by an application of the laboratory method wherein groups of students would be created to simulate the official and general public groups ordinarily found in actuality. 3. Means must be

found to make published material available to citizens. 4. Extension service could be made available to organized citizens' groups. Governmental agencies and universities could participate in this move. 5. Varied types of institutes such as *Mr. Whittemore* mentioned should be sponsored for governmental officials on all levels.

Mr. Parker cited the interest of the T.V.A. in citizen education. The generalized story of planning "Communities for Living" has been published for use in schools but has not been accepted. Another approach, the preparation of a text aimed at a specific community seems best. "Building Atlanta's Future" is an example. In its preparation, teachers and others were asked to review and revise material and local support and interest were secured, resulting in more successful use. The State as a whole seems too big a unit to treat in order to develop interest in the planning story. *Mr. Parker* felt that, while much excellent work is being done throughout the country by individual city planners in giving talks to schools, steps should be taken among teacher training institutions to stimulate an understanding of the educational opportunities inherent in a curriculum which would focus attention on community problems and resources.

In North Carolina, through the efforts of the State University and the State Department of Public Instruction, a Resource Use Education Commission was established. This action was taken with the assistance and advice of the Committee on Southern Regional Studies and Education. Forty-eight North Carolina state agencies and institutions are participating as member agencies of the Commission which was appointed by the Governor. The Commission has an operating budget and employs a full-time staff to work with teacher training institutions in furthering the aims of the Resource Use Education program.

Resource use education attempts to bring together the school and the community and to encourage active participation on the part of students, teachers, and parents in community planning and action.

While the Resource Use Education program is not conducted in the name of "planning education," its aims and objectives are similar, and it suggests a method, which might be adapted elsewhere, of reaching teachers colleges and bringing about citizen education in planning on a state-wide basis.

Mr. Burdell was able to show that the various methods of arousing public interest were less productive in a huge metropolitan area. The enormity and complexity of the problems encountered seem too much for the citizens; and the architects, engineers and other planners seem to work in a vacuum. A number of efforts in adult education and community relationship were well-organized, provided stellar speakers, etc. but interested only a negligible percentage of the public. When an outlying community was aided by student work to solve a transportation problem, the benefits were evident, were appreciated by

the community, and the active field problem was of advantage to student training.

Mr. Wilkins felt that the use of field studies for classes was of great aid in training of students. A novel and beneficial item in course work is a requirement that the students report on the status of planning in their home towns. Aside from the research and study of benefit to the student, he found that the community officials were stimulated by this approach and interest.

Mr. Shurtleff summarized the discussion in an able manner and gave corroborative evidence with specific examples of his own which strengthened the conclusions made by others. His summarization and *Mr. Elwood's* closing comments made it seem desirable that a group comparable to this panel continue to work and meet as a part of the National Citizens Conference on Planning.

The following resolutions were adopted by the Round Table:

1. This committee of the A.P.C.A. should be made permanent.
2. This committee believes that one of the most valuable means of citizen education is through or by Institutes or Short Courses with local planning officials and others participating.
3. This committee would like to see the "primer on planning" now issued by the Federal Government (which is out of date) revised. Perhaps the members of the committee itself might undertake this task.
4. This committee urges contacts with Teachers Colleges and urges a course and lectures on planning in all teacher training schools.

INDEX

Alabama, 58.
Albrecht, Geo., J., 176–178.
Albright, Horace M., xii.
Alexander, Harry W., xi, 132–144.
Am. Nature Assn., xi.
Am. Planning & Civic Assn., ix–xii, 2, 8, 10, 90, 144, 162, 165–169, 175.
Am. Road Builders Assn., 117
Am. Shore & Beach Preservation Assn., 38, 40.
Am. Soc. of Landscape Architects, 53.
Arizona, 58.
Arkansas, 58
Arlington, Va., 69.

Bacon, Edmund N., 122–124.
Baltimore, 69.
Barber, A. B., x.
Barber, Earle N., 122–124.
Bartholomew, Harland, x, xi, 71, 73, 78–88, 157, 170.
Baton Rouge, La., 67–78.
Batstone, Frank A., 43–49.
Berlin, 68.
Bestor, Paul, ix, 11–13, 28.
Big Thompson project, 28.
Birmingham, 69.
Black, Russell Van N., ix, 29–32, 41, 42, 43–49.
Blue Ridge Parkway, 8.
Boston, 107.
Bronx River Parkway, 92–3.
Brown, J. Theron, Baton Rouge, 73.
Burdell, E. S., 176–178.
Bureau of Land Management, 20.
Burnett, John R., xi, 170–172.
Burt, Struthers, ix, 9–10.
Butler bill in Senate, 5.
Buttenheim, H. S., 173–175.

California, 36, 58.
Caplaw, Prof. Theodore, 119.
Carnegie, Andrew, 91.
Carrington, Paul, 163.
Cavicchia, Hon. Peter A., xi, 131–132, 152.
Clark, Frederick P., 173–175.
Clarke, Gilmore D., x, 91–95.
Cohen, Henry, 121.
Connecticut state parks, 35, 57–58.
Conner, J. P., 41, 125–127.
Connor, Edward D., 152, 173–175.
Copley, Lawrence, 126.
Corps of Engineers, 16, 18, 21, 23.
Council on Civic Needs, St. Louis, 158 ff.
Cox, Laurie D., ix, 50–58.
Croley, Paul F., 125–127.
Cullman, Howard S., 103.

Dallas, Texas, 160–164.
Davis, Dwight F., 157.
Delano, Frederic A., xii.
Delaware, 58.
Denver, 67, 69, 142.
DeVoto, Bernard, ix, 25–27, 28.
Dill, Malcolm H., 125–127.
Draper, Earle S., xi.
Drury, Newton B., ix, 1–8.

Elder, Alexander, x, 88–90.
Eliot, Charles, 52.
Elston bill, 22.
Elwood, P. H., xi, 176–178.
Emery, Geo. F., 122–124.
Essex Co., N. J., 88, 142, 148, 149.

Federal City, Com. of 100, xii.
Fish and Wildlife Serv., 20.
Florida, 58.
Foeller, Robt. F., 150–152.
Forest Service, U. S., 20.
Forman, Dr. Jonathan, 13.
Forrestal, Jas., Secy. of Defense, 153.
Francis, H. Kenyon, 41–42, 43–49.
Friends of the Land, ix, 12, 13.

Gallup Poll, 117.
Garden Club of Am., The, xi.
Garrison, J. Mitchell, xi, 153–154.
Georgia, 58.
Goldstein, Mrs. J. Walter, 41.
Goodrich, Ernest P., 125.
Grand Canyon, 6.
Grand Teton National Park, 9–10.
Grant, Maj. Gen. U. S. 3rd, xii, 42.

Hagios, J. Anton, xi, 144–150.
Hamilton, Alexander, 35.
Hayward, Geo. C., 125–127.
Herlihy, Elisabeth, ix, 43–49.
Hobbs, Clark S., 122–124.
Hopley, Russell J., 153.
Hornaday, Dr. Wm. T., 91.
Houston, 69.
Hutchinson Dr. Parkway, 93.

Idaho, 58.
Illinois, 36, 58, 78.
Indiana, 57, 58.
Inglis, Jas. H., 122–124.
Iowa, 58.
Izaak Walton League, ix, 10, 14–24.

Jackson Hole, ix, 9–10.
Jacksonville, Fla., 69.
James, Harlean, xii.
James, Henry A., 27–28.
Jones, Jas. C., 157.

Kansas, 59.
Kentucky, 59.
Kingery, Robt., 125–127, 152.
Klein, Eugene S., 157.
Kuser, Mrs. Frederick T., 173–175.

Leeman, Chas. W., Mayor, Omaha, 153.
LeFevre bill in House, 5.
Leopold, Aldo, 12.
Levin, David, 125–127.
Lewis, Harold M., 125–127.
London, 68.
Longwill, Will, Baton Rouge, 73.
Louisiana, 59.

McClain, Joseph A., xi, 155–159.
McCrosky, T. T., 173–175.
McFarland, J. Horace, ix.
Maine, 59.
Malthus theory of pop., 26.

Martin, Park H., xi, 173–175.
Maryland, 59.
Massachusetts, 36, 59.
Merrill, H. A., 176–178.
Merrill, E. D., x, 104, 113–117.
Mesa Verde Nat. Park, 7.
Meyer, Maynard, xi, 165–169.
Miami, Fla., 69.
Michigan, 59.
Middleton, P. E., 43–49.
Miller, Spencer, Jr., ix, 34–38, 41.
Milwaukee, 165–169.
Minnesota, 59.
Missouri, 36, 59, 78.
Mitchell, Robt., A., x, 117–120.
Montana, 59.
Moore, Granville W., xi, 160–164, 173–175.
Moses, Robt. H., 95.
Mundt bills, 22–24.
Murphy, Hon. Vincent J., xi, 128–130, 131, 151, 170.

Nat. Council on Roadside Imp., xi.
Nat. Council of State Garden Clubs, xi.
Nat. Conf. on State Parks, 10, 50.
Nat. Park Service, ix, 1–8, 20, 60.
Nebraska, 59.
Nevada, 59.
Newark, N. J., 62, 107, 128–130, 131–151, 170–172.
New Hampshire, 59.
New Jersey, 29–33, 33–38, 59.
New Mexico, 59.
New York Met. Region, 61.
New York Port Authority, 96–104, 139.
New York State, 36, 59.
Niles, Wm. White, 91.
Ninde, Lee J., 152, 173–175.
Noble, Chas. M., x, 104–112.
North Carolina, 59.
North Dakota, 59.
Norton, C. McKim. 175.

Ogden, Utah, 27.
Ohio, 36, 59.
Oklahoma, 36, 59.
Oregon, 59.
Olmsted, F. L., Jr., 1, 57.
Olmsted, F. L., Sr., 53, 54, 56, 57.
Olympic Nat. Park, 4.
Omaha, 153–154.
Oppermann, Paul, x, 122–124.
Osborn, Fairfield, ix, 11.
Osborn, F. J., 61.

Parker, J. A., 176–178.
Paterson, Wm., 160.
Pennsylvania, 36, 60.
Petersburg, Va., 70.
Peterson, Mrs. Duane L., 173–175.
Philadelphia, 69, 117.
Pittsburgh, 68, 69.
Portsmouth, Va., 70.
Planning & Civic Comment, xi.
Preston, John O., 126.
Public Health Service, U. S., 23.
Public Roads Admr., 110, 118.

Randall, Clifford A., xi, 165–169.
Reclamation Service, U. S., 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21.
Redwood Highway, 8.
Reed, Thos. H., x, 67–77.
Regional Plan Assn., N. Y., 61–66.
Reid, Kenneth A., ix, 14–24, 25.
Rhode Island, 60.
Richards, Wallace, 173–175.
Richmond, Va., 70.
Roadside Improvement, Joint Conf., xi.
Roanoke, Va., 70.
Roberts, Owen J., xii.
Robin, John P., 122–124.
Rockefeller, Jno. D., Jr., 9–10.
Rodgers, Hon. J. Woodall, 163.
Rogue River, Oregon, 20.
Roosevelt, Theodore, ix, 25.
Rope, Dr. Frederick T., 173–175.

St. Louis, 68, 69, 78–88, 142, 155–159.
Salt Lake City, 27.
San Francisco, 69.
Saw Mill Parkway, 93.
Scott, Ronald, 41–42, 43–49.
Sharpe, C. Melvin, xii.
Shaw, A. H. C., x, 125–127.
Shurtleff, Flavel, 125–127, 176–178.
South Carolina, 60.
South Dakota, 36, 60.
Smith, Luther Ely, 157.
Smith, J. Spencer, ix, 38–40, 42.
Soil Conservation Service, 20.
Solow, Anatole A., 122–124.
Spence bill, 22.
State parks, 50–57, 58 ff.
Stevens, Walter B., 156.

Tampa, 69.
Tennessee, 60.
TVA, 45.
Texas, 60.
Tobin, Austin J., x, 96–103.
Torkelson, M. W., 43–49.
Trenton, N. J., 107.

Utah, 26, 60.

Vermont, 60.
Vinsel, Kenneth, xi, 173–175.
Virginia, 60, 69.
Vogt, Wm., ix.

Walbridge, C. P., 156.
Walker, David M., 122–124.
Walker, Mabel L., 104.
Wallace, Tom, ix, 10, 28.
Ward, Wm. L., 92.
Wasach Mts., 26.
Washington State, 60.
Webster, Alvah J., 43–49.
Wells, H. G., 164.
Wells, Mrs. W. H., 173–175.
Westchester Co., 91, 93.
West Virginia, 60.
Whittemore, Prof. H. O., 41, 176–178.
Wilkie, John, 173–175.
Windels, Paul, x, 61–66.
Wisconsin, 36, 60.
Wyoming, 60.

Woodbrige, John P., 151.

Yosemite Valley, 3.

Zisman, S. B., 173–175.